THE J. PAUL GETTY MUSEUM LIBRARY

Jan 21
A½ gas net

Coll
Cat 10,80
Pty Italy

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Getty Research Institute

https://archive.org/details/venetianpainting00fioc

VENETIAN PAINTING
OF THE SEICENTO AND THE SETTECENTO

VENETIAN PAINTING OF THE SEICENTO AND THE SETTECENTO

by

GIUSEPPE FIOCCO

Professor at the University of Padua

ND
621
V5
F582

PANTHEON · CASA EDITRICE · FIRENZE
THE PEGASUS PRESS · PARIS

PRINTED IN ITALY

COPYRIGHT 1929 BY PANTHEON • CASA EDITRICE • FLORENCE

THE J. PAUL GETTY MUSEUM LIBRARY

CONTENTS

LIST OF PLATES VII
TEXT
Introduction 1
The Mannerists 3
Tradition and Innovation 10
The new School 26
The new Currents in Art 38
The Dawn of the eighteenth Century 52
Conclusion 68
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTISTS 73
GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY 87
INDEX OF ARTISTS 91
GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX 97
PLATES 1-88

LIST OF PLATES

1 Palma il Giovane. *The doge Cicogna hears Mass.* Venice, Oratorio dei Crociferi.
2 Damiano Mazza. *The Holy Family and Saints.* Florence, Palazzo Pitti.
3 Padovanino. *The Incredulity of St. Thomas.* Padua, Eremitani.
4 Padovanino. *Detail of the Marriage at Cana.* Venice, Accademia.
5 Domenico Fetti. *The Lost Sheep.* Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.
6 Domenico Fetti. *The Parable of the Blind Men.* Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.
7 Domenico Fetti. *Portrait of the actor Gabrielli.* Leningrad, Hermitage.
8 Carlo Saraceni and Giovanni Le Clerc. *Enrico Dandolo preaching the Crusade in San Marco.* Venice, Ducal Palace.
9 Giovanni Liss. *The Game of Morra.* Cassel, Gemäldegalerie.
10 Giovanni Liss. *The Ecstasy of St. Jerome.* Venice, Church of the Tolentini.
11 Bernardo Strozzi. *Madonna della pappa.* Venice, Brass Collection.
12 Bernardo Strozzi. *The Rape of Europa.* Posen, Raczynski Collection.
13 Bernardo Strozzi. *The Martyrdom of St. Sebastian.* Venice, San Benedetto.
14 Bernardo Strozzi. *The doge Francesco Erizzo.* Vienna, Kunsthistor. Museum.
15 Bernardo Strozzi. *The Sleeping Child.* Vienna, Czernin Collection.
16 Bernardo Strozzi. *Portrait of an Old Woman.* Florence, Private Collection.
17 Niccolò Renieri. a. *St. Sebastian.* Milan, Castello Sforzesco.
b. *Santa Martire.* Padua, Museum.
18 Ermanno Stroiffi. *Pietà.* Padua, Church of the Filippini.
19 Ermanno Stroiffi. *Salome.* Padua, Museum.
20 Ermanno Stroiffi. *Portrait of the Artist (?).* Vienna, Dr. Kieslinger's Collection.
21 Sebastiano Mazzoni. *The Death of Cleopatra.* Rovigo, Accad. dei Concordi.
22 Sebastiano Mazzoni. *The Finding of Moses.* Rovigo, Accademia dei Concordi.
23 Sebastiano Mazzoni. *Portrait of a Condottiero.* Padua, Museum.
24 Tiberio Tinelli (?). *Portrait of the poet Giulio Strozzi.* Florence, Uffizi.
25 Filippo Zaniberti. *Truth discovered by Time.* Venice, Ducal Palace.
26 Filippo Zaniberti. *Rinaldo and Armida.* Munich, Alte Pinakothek.
27 Filippo Zaniberti. *The Three Graces.* London, National Gallery.
28 Francesco Maffei. *Sacrifice of Melchizedek.* Venice, Palazzo Widman-Foscari.
29 Francesco Maffei. *Salome.* Faenza, Pinacoteca.
30 Francesco Maffei. *Elijah visited by the Angel.* Berlin, Kaiser Friedrich Museum.
31 Pietro Liberi. *The Glory of St. Anthony.* Padua, Sacristia del Santo.
32 Marco Liberi. *Jupiter and Mnemosyne.* Budapest, Fine Arts Museum.
33 Pietro Vecchia. *Portrait of a Warrior.* Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.

34 Pietro Vecchia. *Portrait of a Young Girl.* Karlsruhe, Gemäldegalerie.
35 Gerolamo Forabosco. *David.* Bologna, Private Collection.
36 Gerolamo Forabosco. *The Shipwreck* (detail). Malamocco, Arcipretale.
37 Gerolamo Forabosco. *The two Sisters.* Milan, Castello Sforzesco.
38 Gerolamo Forabosco. *Menichina Padovana.* Rome, Corsini Gallery.
39 Gerolamo Forabosco. *Portrait of a Lady.* Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.
40 Giulio Carpioni. *Soap Bubbles.* Vicenza, Museum.
41 Giulio Carpioni. *Latona changes the peasants into frogs.* Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.
42 Francesco Ruschi. *Christ and the Woman of Samaria.* Venice, Accademia.
43 Francesco Ruschi. *The Repudiation of Hagar.* Treviso, Pinacoteca.
44 Antonio Carneo. *Christ and the Tribute Money.* Udine, San Giacomo.
45 Antonio Carneo. *Winter.* Udine, formerly in the Caiselli Collection.
46 Antonio Carneo. a. & b. *Vertumnus and Pomona.* Udine, formerly in the Caiselli Collection.
47 Antonio Carneo. *Card Players.* Udine, formerly in the Caiselli Collection.
48 Giambattista Langetti. *Apollo and Marsyas.* Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.
49 Carlo Loth. *The Dying Jacob blessing Joseph.* Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.
50 Carlo Loth. *Mercury casting a spell upon Argus.* London, National Gallery.
51 Antonio Zanchi. *The Good Samaritan.* Bergamo, Goltara-Lussana Collection.
52 Antonio Zanchi. *Abraham dividing the World with Lot.* Venice, S. Maria del Giglio.
53 Pietro Bellotto. a. *An Old Woman.* Stuttgart, Gemäldegalerie.
b. *A Young Girl.* Brunswick, Museum.
54 Antonio Bellucci. *Venus and Cupid.* Munich, Alte Pinakothek.
55 Antonio Molinari. *The Drunkenness of Noah.* Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.
56 Sebastiano Bombelli. *Half-length Portrait of a Nobleman.* Venice, Querini Stampalia Collection.
57 Sebastiano Bombelli. *Full-length Portrait of a Senator.* Venice, Querini Stampalia Collection.
58 Luca Carlevaris. *The Reception of the Ambassador Colloredo.* Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.
59 Giambattista Piazzetta. *The Fortune-Teller.* Venice, Accademia.
60 Giambattista Piazzetta. *The Ecstasy of St. Francis.* Vicenza, Museo Civico.
61 Giambattista Piazzetta. *Portrait of a Priest.* London, National Gallery.
62 Giambattista Piazzetta. *Ceiling of the Chapel of San Domenico* (detail). Venice, Santi Giovanni e Paolo.
63 Sebastiano Ricci. *The Ascension.* Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.

64 Giambattista Tiepolo. *The Sacrifice of Isaac.* Dresden, Gemäldegalerie.

65 Giambattista Tiepolo. *La Madonna del Carmine.* Milan, Brera.

66 Giambattista Tiepolo. *The Triumph of Eloquence. Ceiling* (detail). Venice, Palazzo Sandi-Porto.

67 Giambattista Tiepolo. *Rachel hiding the household gods.* Udine, Archbishop's Palace.

68 Giambattista Pittoni. *The Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes.* Venice, Accademia.

69 Nicola Grassi. *Ecce Homo.* Trieste, Museo Civico.

70 Nicola Grassi. *The Adoration of the Magi.* Udine, Chiesa dell'Ospedale.

71 Marco Ricci. *Imaginary Landscape.* Venice, Accademia.

72 Sebastiano Ricci. a. *Penitent Monks,* drawing. Venice, Accademia.
b. *Penitent Monks.* Venice, Brass Collection.

73 Sebastiano Ricci. *The Temptation of St. Anthony.* Munich, Alte Pinakothek.

74 Francesco Guardi. *Capriccio* (*Professional Story Teller und view of Cogollo, Trentino*). Berlin, formerly in the Haberstock Collection.

75 Marco Ricci. *Storm at Sea.* Bologna, Pinacoteca.

76 Sebastiano and Marco Ricci. *Landscape with Monks.* Edinburgh, National Gallery.

77 a. Alessandro Magnasco. *Landscape.* Venice, Private Collection.
b. Sebastiano and Marco Ricci. *Landscape.* Trieste, Museo Rivoltella.

78 Sebastiano and Marco Ricci. a. Sketch for *Moses drawing water from the Rock.* Venice, formerly in the Dal Zotto Collection.
b. Detail of *Landscape with women washing clothes.* Trieste, Museo Rivoltella.

79 Giuseppe Zais. *Imaginary Landscape.* Venice, Accademia.

80 Antonio Canal. *View of the Grand Canal.* Vienna, Liechtenstein Gallery.

81 Antonio Canal. *View of the Church and School of the Carità.* London, National Gallery.

82 a. Jan Van der Heyden. *Landscape.* London, National Gallery.
b. Antonio Canal. *Eton College.* London, National Gallery.

83 Francesco Guardi. Organ-panels from San Raffaele, Venice: *Hope and Charity* (1747). Sarasota (Florida, u. s. a.), Ringling Collection.

84 Francesco Guardi. *A Ladies' Concert.* Munich, Alte Pinakothek.

85 Francesco Guardi. *The Lagoon near Malghera.* London, National Gallery.

86 Pietro Longhi. *The Exhibition of the Rhinoceros.* Venice, Museo Correr.

87 Alessandro Longhi. a. *The Exhibition of the Rhinoceros.* Private Collection.
b. *The Charlatan.* Frankfort, Städelsches Institut.

88 Alessandro Longhi. *A Reception.* Venice, Palazzo Grassi-Stucky.

THE TEXT

INTRODUCTION

TO Europe in the seventeenth century «painting» meant the painting of the Venetian district which in its colour had paved the way for progress and for modern art. But Venice, after producing within a few decades three of the greatest artists — Titian, Paolo Veronese and Tintoretto — who might have been thought to have established art for ever, lapsed into the most forlorn mannerism.

When the awakening came Art was no longer the privilege of Italy alone, although she was at the head of the new baroque movement with Michelangelo da Caravaggio in painting and Francesco Borromini in architecture, who flourished in Rome but came of that northern stock which, from mediaeval Lombard masters down to the Venetians of the Renaissance, had always shown marked anti-classical tendencies. The Luther of art found his best response coming from beyond the Alps, from those champions of reform from the North and from the South — Rubens, Velasquez, Vermeer, Rembrandt. The world, in short, saw Art enter upon a great international period.

Venice, however, the seat of the Doges and perhaps the most worldly and the most frequented city of the century, remained the goal of all those who sought the joy and the light of really great painting. It was this that made possible her redemption from the slough of mannerism. Domenico Fetti, a Roman, Giovanni Liss, a German, and Bernardo Strozzi, a Genoese, all met in the city to which they had come to spend a certain time in study. So enamoured were they of Venice that they worked and died there as faithful as her most devoted sons. Many were scandalized and angered by what they considered the indecorum of their work, but in the end it overcame such opposition, for Venice could not remain blind for ever to the truth and charm of such painting, which derived ultimately from the austere reforms of Caravaggio.

The local traditions had been kept alive — a small and fluttering flame — by Alessandro Varotari, called Padovanino, and it was when the work of the foreign artists accepted these traditions that it reached its fullest power. Padovanino knew the influence of Titian, not as all believe, as a member of his school but as a follower of his fellow-citizen Damiano Mazza, whose work he continued and who, in his turn, was a direct disciple of Vecellio. Padovanino was an honest late-comer — a sixteenth-century artist who found himself stranded in the seventeenth century — who could reach no great heights but who taught in his flourishing school that the past was a treasure to be treated with respect, not to be ruthlessly plundered. He had both true and false adherents, but it was not from them but from

the mannerists that there came strong opposition to the new movements. Gerolamo Forabosco belonged to the school that was willing to consider any sincere innovation and it was he who taught Gregorio Lazzarini, whose boast it was to have guided the first steps of Giambattista Tiepolo.

Their own work grew more vital by their very willingness to accept new forms that were sincere, building for the glorious future of art and winning back by their good example even those who, like Francesco Maffei and Filippo Zaniberti, had gone astray in their art.

After Ruschi, a Roman, and Langetti and Rosa of Genoa, there came a group who favoured the strong play of light and shade, and who attached themselves to Carlo Loth of Munich and to Antonio Zanchi of Este, and their work, through Molinari, was the happy inspiration of Giambattista Piazzetta.

By way of Strozzi, on the other hand, we come to that eccentric Florentine Sebastiano Mazzoni, who prepared the way for the art of Ricci, while in Friuli Antonio Carneo heralded Bombelli, master of Fra Galgario, and initiated Nicola Grassi, compatriot and precursor of Giambattista Pittoni.

I have tried in this book to throw light upon much that has been forgotten and misunderstood and to summarize the results of long researches made by myself and others, adding the links that were necessary to make a uniform whole. I have sought, that is to say, to bridge the gulf between the fragmentary work that has been done hitherto and the history that is still to write.

Only thus can we see how the better painting of the Venetian district in the seventeenth century came, through its many struggles, to be what it is, and appreciate how much these early difficulties were a necessary and by no means an unworthy prologue to the splendid flowering that is the consummation of Venetian art.

One might have ended a history of this unusual kind at the eighteenth century; but it then might well have appeared unfinished and profitless, since, in the first place, the seventeenth century lasted beyond the time reckoned by dates and, in the second place, its consequences — that is to say its claim to be considered of value — reach forward to that point when the glorious century that followed shone forth in all its new brilliance.

We have then recalled the essential movements, trying to show that if the necessary history of the seventeenth century was still to be told, that of the eighteenth century had in great part to be rewritten. It had to be rewritten taking account not only of the greatest but of the moderately good and lesser artists, worthy and forgotten precursors and companions of the heroes — the metallic refuse, as it were, which is put aside to allow the light of genius to shine more clearly.

THE MANNERISTS

In Venice, towards the end of the sixteenth century, there were all conditions necessary for an outburst of baroque art: the ground had been prepared for this only in Venice where there was some real knowledge of painting. The schools from Giambellino to Giorgione had used colour in a constructive and essential manner and, by stages, with increasing power, they had achieved command of tone and of aerial perspective, which culminated in the work of Titian whom we see in his old age using exquisitely and mysteriously the whole gamut of colour. Venice too had always demanded, and in great measure brought about a revolution in the classical canons of perfect rhythm, and composition, avoiding the fixity of central inspiration, had grown less mechanical and seemed in the work of Tintoretto, with his handling of light and his startling use of angles, to reach further and further towards the infinite, of which each single composition is a minute fragment.

From Mantua, where Mantegna had ruled as master, and where Giulio Pippi had handed on the torch of Raphael and Michelangelo, and Primaticcio that of Correggio, Paolo Veronese had brought the skill in the use of tone and colour, the mastery of light and shade, which had given a new impetus to the work of Emilia and of Rome. The Venetians who had preferred the somewhat homely composition of the smaller easel-piece, now reinvigorated, as it were, by the breath of a giant, grew more ambitious and began to decorate the walls of palaces and villas; they allied their work with architecture, ready to undertake the risky acrobatics demanded by the painting of ceilings and by their pleasure in sumptuous cornices, and all this they achieved without that divorce of drawing and painting, upon which the schools had insisted to the prejudice of artistic unity and sincerity.

Venice, although she had shown a preference for subjects dear to the Baroque, had always been in the van of progress in painting, and this is particularly striking in the treatment of landscape: in the earliest work of Giambellino for example and in that of Giorgione the landscape becomes as important as the figures with which it is peopled, so that we find the Rural Scene in the Louvre, and more noticeably the Giovanelli Tempesta, showing a modernity of conception suggestive of painting as recent as that of Renoir and Manet. And Titian, in his drawings — I am thinking of the typical work of Darmstadt — as much as in his painting, such as the Mountain Scene with the shepherd in Buckingham Palace, frees himself from the constraint imposed by the use of figures; and his work has an intrinsic value, similar to, but independent of, the Flemish School. The feeling for nature reigns supreme, but is always governed by a selective good taste which robs the landscapes of some of

their character and makes them almost uniform, though they succeed in rendering the poetry of certain country-sides, notably in the work of Vecellio and his followers, where Domenico Campagnola above all showed a real understanding of the Alpine landscape. The valley of the Piave with Mount Pizzocco and the villages on its slopes, such as Mel, yields the more genial features of the Dolomite landscape which assert themselves in the work of the master — so that it identifies itself with the wider prospect somewhat below Belluno of the background of the Venus with the musician in the Kaiser Friedrich Museum at Berlin.

This power in the handling of landscape was the basis of all Italian art, although the early artists of the seventeenth century were influenced by foreign models dominant on all sides, particularly by Adam Elsheimer. The spirit which we see in the early works of Annibale Carracci, such as the Hunting and Fishing Scenes in the Louvre, became supreme in the art of the eighteenth century along with a certain note of heroic, ornate landscape which had been popular in Rome with Marco Ricci, the leader of this school in Venetia. Venice on the other hand, where the somewhat soft atmosphere brightens its picturesque and almost oriental quality, provided a wealth of local colour which quickly became typical of the work that came from the lagoons. We are indebted to Gentile Bellini for having given us a picture of the Piazza San Marco and of the Rio di San Lorenzo as they were at the end of the fifteenth century. These works were the forerunners of the careful Canaletto and of Carpaccio who, with his romantic spirit, foreshadows Francesco Guardi.

The work of Iacopo Bassano, although imbued with the spirit of Paolo Fiammingo, has a much more personal aspect and a richness of colour altogether Venetian; in his Parables and in scenes from the Old Testament he showed the way to the treatment of *genre*. And, following him, a crowd of his own relatives, from his sons Francesco, Gerolamo and Leandro to his grandson Iacopo Apollonio, as well as disciples such as the gifted Pietro Marescalchi, called «lo Spada» a native of Feltre, continued to reproduce and to vary in their own distinctive ways the style which he had bequeathed to them, handling it with a mastery and success recognized by all. And with Leandro, in certain respects the best of Iacopo's sons and of prime importance for the portrait-painting of the seventeenth century, and especially for that of the Carracci and of Bartolomeo Passerotti, we arrive at the year 1623.

Still that spirit, that richness of colouring, these achievements in art, did not bring about the appearance in Venice — herself a precursor — of the new style of painting. Before the zenith of the great school of the sixteenth century had been reached in Titian, Tintoretto and Paolo Veronese, there had already been signs of a lack of imagination, of mannerism *avanti lettera*, but these signs were so exceptional that

they were to art in general what the Madonneri were to pure Byzantine painting. The artists of the Santacroce family — father, son and grandson — and their numerous relatives and followers are a most striking example of this school. They did not hesitate to accept any style, local or foreign, to treat everything as an addition to a repertory from which they pillaged, using what they took in a manner that was indeed skilful, but manifestly false. In the studio of Bonifacio which had produced a large group of masters, culminating in Tintoretto and Iacopo Bassano and followed by good enough artists such as Schiavone and Polidoro da Lanciano, the standard grew laxer, thanks to the leaning towards a rather facile and insipid style which can be seen in a series of works of Vitrulio Buonconsiglio and Antonio Palma, the father of Iacopo the younger.

To this collection — daubs rather than paintings — must be added the work of artists of the Roman school like Battista Franco, Ponchino called Bazzacco, Giulio Licinio, Giovanni Fratino called Del Mio and many others of the school of Raphael and Michelangelo who did not even attempt to adapt their formulae to Venetian art, which is so essentially pictorial. And while Robusti and Caliari took advantage of these ideas, the Venetians appeared to be stifled by them as if overcome by some heavy indigestible meal, and in their desire to follow the fashion, which was natural considering the fame of the great Roman schools, even artists of standing like Paris Bordone ruined their work with the cold composition of which the Gladiatorial Combat of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna is typical.

Titian, and above all Veronese, Tintoretto and Bassano, had gathered round them a group of their relatives and disciples who looked upon them as teachers — masters whom they must follow loyally — while a few of those who detached themselves from the school tried with more will than sincerity to ally their devotion to the master with the assertion of their own personality. The work of Parrasio Michieli is the best example of this attempted alliance.

It was therefore natural that Venetian art, once the driving genius had disappeared, the men whose mastery no one could dispute or succeed to (because Greco who alone had the power to do this had taken his genial art to the solitudes of Spain), fell sick of mannerism, the disease that characterizes every period of great wealth and corruption.

Instead of a spontaneous art there was now a definite programme, and it seemed that these pillagers of the past, held as it were at the goal, awaited only the disappearance of the ancient glories to hurl themselves upon everything with a ruthless fury that knew no pause. Venice, the home of painting, lived shamelessly upon the glory of her past and now, in the uniformity of style, destroyed every incentive to

rivalry, which consisted in belonging to some school or other even in face of a hostile world. Titian, Veronese, Tintoretto were almost forgotten; interest centred now in art which sought inspiration in any quarter if it might please all and weary none, beginning with those who created it — a miscellany, with nothing of the eclecticism desired by the Carracci: it was a heavy mixture — meticulous scholastic wisdom, the science of the academies and the schools which now began to replace the practical work of the studio.

Even the valuable contribution of Veronese, that of decorative painting, which opened to Venetian art new and untrodden ways and taught it that the sister arts, architecture and sculpture, were closely allied, was forgotten and only taken up in the eighteenth century. Only a few provincials — disciples of the same school as Caliari — kept the school alive with difficulty until the time of Francesco Montemezzano and Dario Varotari (the father of Padovanino) who died at the very end of the century.

Not even those who came from all parts of Italy and Europe, attracted by the fame of Venetian art, could resist the general corruption. Matteo Ingoli, from Ravenna, Odoardo Fialetti of Bologna, the Flemish Pietro Mera, the German Sebastian Casser, called Tintoretto, son-in-law and heir of the great master, Antonio Vassillacchi called the Aliense, a native of the Greek city of Milo, not to speak of those naturalized like Baldassare d'Anna, produced no work which could render them famous.

The only painter of any importance in the group was Ludwig Toeput, called Pozzoserrato, a Flemish artist who worked specially at Treviso with Paolo Fiammingo dei Freschi who was perhaps the Pauwels Frank of Antwerp, a collaborator of Tintoretto. In their paintings of landscape backgrounds, which had hitherto mirrored so faithfully the neighbouring country-side, there is a foreign vein which certainly contributed to the development of the school of the Da Ponte.

But it cannot be said that, although decadent, the art of Venice was exhausted, even for those who were unwilling to accept new ideas and preferred to follow faithfully the teaching of the old school.

Baldassare Longhena asserted his beliefs plainly and effectively in the field of architecture, and between 1583 and 1682 he remained loyal to the picturesque local art, making no striking break with the past — not perhaps the most gifted, but one of the greatest builders of all whom Venice can boast. It was precisely his appreciation of local taste, his wisdom in handling subjects typical of the city — so striking in this respect since the days of Byzantine and Gothic art — which constituted his chief title to glory, for he resisted the unaccustomed and eccentric novelties of Palladio, proving that art, although faithful to tradition, can develop

creatively when the past is treated not as a legacy to be wasted, but as an inheritance to be spent fruitfully.

The mannerists (Leonardo Corona, Pietro Malombra, Giovanni Contarini, Alvise dal Friso, Andrea Vicentino, Maffeo Verona, Antonio de' Ferrari called Foler, Camillo Ballini, Santo Peranda, Matteo Ponzone and others unworthy of note) range from Veronese to Tintoretto, from Titian back to Veronese — faithful neither to any tradition, nor to any master, confusing as they do one idea with another, wavering in their allegiance, moving from the masters of yesterday to those of tomorrow, doubtful of any innovation, growing weaker in their attempt to reach the best in painting, to express that passion for true art, the unquestionable glory of Venice, which even in the most modest way Venetian art had never betrayed.

These lesser artists, led ever further astray in their quest, need not detain us as they grow more conventional and diffuse in their gloomy uniformity and falsehood. It is enough to mention Iacopo Negretti called Palma Giovane (1544-1628) who, on account of his talent, his skill and his good fortune, has always been acknowledged as representing and excelling that school. A great-grandson of the famous Palma Vecchio, a follower of Giorgione, son of that disciple of Bonifacio, Antonio Palma, Iacopo belonged to a well-known family of artists and had besides the good fortune to be the favourite disciple of the great Titian in his old age, beside whose name he put his own on that last and admirable work, the Pietà, which was to honour the master's tomb. *Ab uno disce omnes.*

He lacked nothing that skill, influence or teaching could give to help him to become a great artist. The Adoration of Christ by the two Doges Lorenzo and Gerolamo Priuli with their patron saints in the Sala del Senato in the Ducal Palace is a good example of his work: the composition is excellent and the richness of the colouring is reminiscent of Titian — no unworthy model. The paintings in the sacristy of San Giacomo dell'Orio, executed to the order of the priest Gian Maria da Ponte, who figures in them, are no less worthy of attention: a certain haste and roughness in the work does not detract from the play of light and the wealth of colour.

We cannot quarrel with the artist for adding to the majestic style of Vecellio something of the impetuosity of Tintoretto; this became more and more evident in the series in the Oratorio dei Crociferi near the church of the Gesuiti which he began in 1583 and carried out with the help of pupils. The panels on the walls are dedicated to the foundation of the order, the ceiling to the glory of the Virgin and the altar-piece to the Adoration of the Magi. *Plate 1*

It was after his journeys to Rome that the painter gave himself up completely to mannerism: he developed a style lacking all inventiveness, tedious in its monotony

of colour and in the uniformity of the types he portrayed. He paints dark-skinned people with red blotches on their cheeks and garments with an unbroken metallic glimmer: the faces are all alike — sleepy — they have no individuality and suggest no diversity of type. To this had come the *buona pratica* of which Ridolfi speaks, reducing art to this and proving to be practice of the worst kind.

The glorious painting of the Venetians had become sleek and lifeless, subdued and without zest. Marco Boschini, whose honest judgement is worth considering amongst much that is corrupt, acknowledges this sad decline in Venetian art, declaring that the artists following Palma resemble one another so closely that they are difficult to distinguish. But this uniformity was essentially the uniformity of death.

Santo Peranda covered the complexity of subject copied from Tintoretto in a bluish cloud, and Carlo Ridolfi abandoned literature to paint pictures where the colour is glaring and mawkish, an outrage on the style of Veronese. Matteo Ponzone added certain features reminiscent of Bassano — taken up and improved upon to some extent by Andrea Vicentino — to his clumsy composition, but there was not enough individual quality in all this work to guide us in trying to distinguish one artist from another.

Although one hesitates to talk of morality in art, one cannot but consider Palma Giovane who was the head of all this group owing to his superior talent, schooling and theories, as responsible for much that art suffered at this time, for he set the example of reckless haste and carelessness which became the rule for the others. These vices are obvious even in the earliest and best work of the group, where one is only too conscious of the absence of that *quid divinum* which gives art its lasting value. What ought to have been approached reverently, this school handled in an almost burlesque manner.

Throughout Europe during the seventeenth century Venetian art was in the ascendant, but Venice herself had no interest in new movements, she stood apart from all enquiry, forgetful and sunk in lethargy, and when the darkness lifted, enlightenment was no longer confined to Italy, even though Italy in the midst of all these ruins had placed herself at the head of the baroque movement with the austere sincerity of Caravaggio in painting and in architecture with the revolt against the slavish acceptance of the laws laid down by Borromini: the flower of this was to be seen in Rome, although its roots were really in the North which had always shown anti-classical tendencies from the masters of Como down to those of Venice.

The finest response did not come from Italy, now somewhat exhausted, and even less from the forgetful Venice. It came from the North, and before long the world saw the blossoming of a new era of international art, greater and fuller than the

Gothic era: which was the European result of the highest tendencies of the Italian Renaissance and acknowledged masters in the North and the South — Rubens, Velasquez, Vermeer, Rembrandt.

Venice, in her apathy, nevertheless remained, even against her will, the haven of all those who rejoiced in beautiful painting, and it was through this that she ultimately found her salvation.

Venice as a whole seemed to be sunk in a Stygian marsh, but the light of the past still glowed strongly enough to illuminate what remained. Documents, found recently, show that young Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio had, on April 6th 1584, when only eleven years old, entered on a four years' apprenticeship to Simone Peterzano or Petrazzano from whom he was to learn the art of painting; and whom Lomazzo, writing in the same year, called «an experienced and talented Venetian artist, a disciple of Titian » who, as a pupil of Vecellio, used to reside in Milan, where the greater part of his work was done. This document is a guide to us in trying to trace the early history of the great reformer. Kallab points out that he had evidently been brought up on the excellent tradition of Venice and had known the teaching of the provincial masters of Cremona and Brescia. It was those sound traditions with which Baglione reproached him in Rome, calling him contemptuously a follower of Giorgione. (*N. Pevsner, Zeitschrift für Bildende Kunst,* 1928, 390 and ibid. 1929, 278; *R. Longhi, Pinacotheca,* 1928, I).

Caravaggio, although he was a strong advocate of reform for all art in Italy and abroad and although he was the direct heir and certainly the best of all the Venetian artists of the late sixteenth century, had struggled fiercely in Rome, Naples and Malta, and had died as a very young man on July 18th 1610 — only then to be widely acclaimed. We gather from a document by Ioppi that he had arrived in Friuli in the year 1612 bringing with him one of his works, of which the date is previous to 1598, and of which the original has perhaps been found at Trieste: there is a copy of the work in the museum at Udine — the Stigmata of St. Francis, showing marked traces of the influence of Savoldo. It was only after his death that he exercised a salutary influence on the city and that the stream of art flowed back once more towards Venice; but in the beginning of the movement, that city, in her decadence, remained blind to it all.

The spark which flickered alone in the darkness of a deadening and powerful mannerism was a new thing: modest and homely, it gave no signs of rebellion, hardly even of courage — it was a mere glimmer. A lonely and provincial glimmer — all that remained of a once powerful tradition.

It is depressing to have to talk of the tradition of early seventeenth-century Venice; it is as if one listened to some exhausted voice heard afar off in the ruins. In Rome at least, factions still holding to the past, ardent mannerists devoted to different masters and leaders of the style of the moment, were quarrelling fiercely. This was not merely the friendly rivalry of artists, for in those days when passions ran high opinions were maintained at the point of the sword.

In Venice life went on quietly and the plunder of the temple was carried out, even amidst the approval of rulers and writers, and met the startled and ironic glance of any well-born stranger who arrived in the City of the Lagoons meaning to give himself up whole-heartedly to study and unwilling to join the spoilers.

Art had become a mere matter of business and to succeed it was necessary to have recourse to cunning, and to seek the protection of the Republic, who feared any innovation, even in the field of art, where only a fine originality is of value.

Mannerism predominated, and it seemed impossible that there should be any reaction against it while it was held in so much respect by patron and client alike and while the art of painting remained sunk in a poverty of ideas. But, lifeless in Venice, art flourished under a less despotic rule outside its capital. In Padua, for instance, the teaching of Titian had still a remarkable influence through the work of one of his disciples, Damiano Mazza, the most academic, but faithful to his master's technique, and certainly the most productive of his followers: an artist on whom much light has still to be thrown, despite Hadeln's excellent but somewhat old-fashioned work (*Zeitschrift f. B. K.* - XXIV n. F. - 11), for today, with knowledge gained from documents and from his works, we are in a better position to judge. There is further, the painting in the Ospedaletto, the works in the Accademia and the great altar-piece at San Barnaba, assigned to him by Martinioni and wrongly attributed for many years by others to Dario Varotari. There is also the Ascension, at Noale, executed in 1573, a small ceiling now in London, the Holy Family and Saints in the Pitti Palace, the Woman taken in Adultery in the Viennese Academy, a canvas formerly at San Silvestro, the Exaltation of the Cross, so much praised by Boschini, now in the possession of the antiquary Podio at Bologna, and a portrait of the master by himself, signed and dated and now in the collection of Sig. Asta in Venice. This shows us on the one hand the countenance of the artist, and on the other makes it clear that his death did not occur before the year 1580, which is the date of the painting. The historical altar-piece in San Silvestro, which Moschini mentions in his guide of 1828, gives us the painter's genius at its highest:

in the intricate arrangement, specially of the figures standing in adoration and of the little page at the feet of St. Helena, work truly worthy of Vecellio.

It is interesting to consider the characteristics and limitations of the artist's work, and these are apparent; especially the cold, confused quality which is seen at once and is so typical. We shall devote our attention therefore to the painted ceiling which used to be in the Casa Sonica at Padua and is now in the National Gallery in London. It is a painting of Ganymede borne away by an eagle, where the clever drawing has a rather heavy, lifeless quality and the limbs are rendered stiffly in glaring colour. The Holy Family in the Pitti Palace shows plainly how *Plate 2* little interest Mazza had in slender, graceful forms, and how much he enjoyed painting full-bodied, almost homely, figures — dignified, but lacking in expression.

If we compare the early work of Alessandro Varotari called Padovanino with these feeble imitations of Titian, we see how faithfully he preserved and almost completely adopted the style of Damiano Mazza.

This obvious discipleship leads me to believe that Padovanino was not a painter of the academic school, deliberately imitating Titian, but the last offshoot of Vecellio and his tradition; and so we have to explain how, on the one hand, it seems that the art of Damiano Mazza had been able to continue up to the beginning of the seventeenth century and on the other, how Alessandro Varotari, son of so keen a follower of Veronese as Dario, had come to be of the school of Titian.

The answer to the first question is either that Damiano Mazza died at an advanced age, in the year 1628, as is stated in the manuscript left by Melchiori, and not so early as is generally accepted: or that his school had continued to flourish, as Boschini insists in his *Ricche Minere*. The one explanation is as good as the other so far as Varotari is concerned: it is enough to say that he was a strict follower of Mazza and therefore an imitator of Vecellio — a Titianesque painter whom time had washed up into the seventeenth century.

It remained to be proved that Padovanino was neither a mannerist nor academic in his tastes as the contemporary Carracci had been, since he had not adopted from Montemezzano the style of Veronese beloved of Dario, while Chiara, his sister, an artist of some repute, in her portrait-painting followed him as closely as she could.

At my suggestion Dr. Ferrari has done all the difficult researches that enable us to make a study of this neglected work. He has established that Chiara, born in 1584, daughter of Dario and Samaritana (the latter a daughter of Ponchino of whom we have spoken as belonging to the Roman school), may have been influenced by the art she knew so well; but that as the father died in 1598, Alessandro, who was born on April 15th 1588, could not have had much of his teaching.

Alessandro's first work of importance, 1610, is his altar-piece in the church of
Plate 3 the Eremitani — the Incredulity of St. Thomas. His devotion to Damiano Mazza, the famous Paduan and the heir to Dario, who had died as a young man, is seen in the majestic simplicity, the movement and expression, and it must be considered not only as the admirable *début,* but also as the masterpiece which this artist never surpassed in his later work. In 1614 he went to Venice where he was not able to keep his place amongst the mannerists who need have felt no alarm, and still less among the Renovators who objected to his weak, anachronistic work and his sixteenth-century outlook.

Nothing is left in Venice of his early works, in spite of the fame and respect he had always commanded, even in the neo-classic nineteenth century, quick to recognize the merit of their very coldness. They were paintings for the church of Santa Giustina and dealt with the life of that saint.

At the same time or a little later Varotari made paintings for Santa Maria Maggiore and, as Veronese had done for San Sebastiano, he continued throughout his life to give celebrated work to this church. Of these Venice has paintings of a Holy Deacon recovering his sight through the intercession of the Virgin and of Cherubs with the Virgin's symbols. The children are sturdy, but not like the small Herculean figures drawn by Michelangelo; these are like Titian's angels — a little too pink and all much too plump.

This early period of the artist's life, spent largely in the quiet atmosphere of Padua was, as I have said, the best. It ends with his painting of the Marriage at
Plate 4 Cana, now in Venice, done in 1622 for the refectory of the convent of S. Giovanni of Verdara in his native town. The dignity of the scene is relieved by a beautiful landscape and by a group of musicians, and the whole is an echo not only of Titian but also of Veronese, supreme master of this kind of composition. It again shows the influence of Veronese's art as do the larger and perhaps later works of Damiano Mazza — the altar-pieces of Noale and of San Barnaba, and the Woman taken in Adultery in the Academy at Vienna. Veronese's influence is seen in the severity and balance, but it lacks some vital quality, although his mastery and his artistic sincerity are undisputed.

It was impossible for the poor, honest Padovanino to go on with his work undisconcerted by the new teaching which dragged him in its wake, he clinging like a drowning man to the past. It is enough to look at the works that remain, without thinking of those that are lost, to see the disaster that overtook the art of Varotari as his painting grew ever emptier, his pictures suggesting red featureless faces with large mild eyes. In addition to the Astronomy of the Biblioteca Marciana, executed

in 1635 to replace a ruined painting of Zelotti, there is a similar picture even more typical: a Judith in the Vienna Museum. There is little to choose between them. A stupid «donna cannone» grandiose in the fluttering exuberance of her matronly garments with her arms crossed on a gigantic sword. Decent enough work but entirely commonplace, although handled with a certain feeling for the older style of painting and a sense of its decorative possibilities.

But the honest Paduan could not turn his gaze obstinately upon the past without suffering the punishment of Lot's wife. He was forced to pit himself against the new school which had come to Venice, to trouble the devout quiet of Varotari, and to break in upon the wantonness of the mannerists. In decorating the Libreria he had to bear comparison with Strozzi, and was actually paid more, for while he received 30 reals the Genoese only got 25. This was an injustice not to be repeated and the struggle grew daily more and more bitter.

In fact we see in the Church of the Incurabili — the decoration of which was begun in the year 1635 — Varotari closely beset, on the one side by the work of Strozzi, and on the other side to his greater discomfort, by Francesco Maffei, a fiery advocate of the new style.

It is true that of that mass of work only a large oval painting of the parable of the Wise and the Foolish Virgins, which we owe to him, remains; the other parable — the Wedding Guest by Strozzi — was put up to auction in the nineteenth century, as can be seen from documents of the period; while all trace of the work of Maffei has been lost. But the oval painting by Padovanino, finished as we know in 1644 (Alessandro died in 1648) only shows how his work had suffered before the fierce assault made upon him in his loyalty to tradition. When compared with a sketch by Bernardo Strozzi, full of promise, which partly compensates us for the ill-advised destruction, the haggard little women of his ceiling with distorted heads and necks seem unable to hold themselves upright. A grey, reddish light suffuses the whole and surrounds the figures with an atmosphere that is both weak and lifeless.

But the devotion lavished upon the sixteenth-century masters — specially upon Titian — despite the fact that it was limited to his work alone, had borne fruit. Padovanino who had the good fortune to belong to both centuries was able to bridge to some extent the gulf by his desire to preserve the traditions despised by his fellow artists; and he had a few followers such as Pietro Damini da Castelfranco (1592-1631), a modest painter from the provinces who kept alive the style of the Bassano, introducing streaks of brilliant colour; but this occurred more in Padua and Vicenza than among the lagoons.

It was there that a collision was bound to arise between the fraudulent and apa-

thetic and the Renovators; and from the school that had followed tradition there arose a group of clever painters, able to adapt the teaching of the old masters to the demands of the new baroque; the results of this large school appear in the painters who derived from it — Pietro Liberi, Pietro Vecchia, Giulio Carpioni, Gerolamo Forabosco — to mention only the best of the new generation of which we shall speak after we have dealt with the older masters to whom we owe the revival of Venetian art. It was this generation which established the value of tradition.

First amongst these comes Domenico Fetti, born in Rome in 1589. Through the influence of his first master, the eclectic Ludovico Cigoli, a native of Tuscany, he became a protégé of the Cardinal Ferdinando Gonzaga, went to Mantua with his patron, when the latter was created a duke (1613), and was court painter until the year 1621, which proved a year of grace for him when, entrusted to make purchases for the Grand Duke's collection of paintings, he went to Venice and found there an atmosphere more suitable for his burning desire to paint and his restless mind. The city took such a hold on him that he remained there until his death in 1624.

In this roundabout way, there came to Venice, which had been so proud and so corrupt, a new directive, derived ultimately from Michelangelo da Caravaggio or from followers of the latter such as Serodine and Borgianni. They had at once developed that sense of the picturesque, too austere perhaps, so marked in the work of the great Renovator. They did not follow him in painting works simplified in colour and glowing with light, but they had a horror of artifice and had learned the value of sincerity in art. The love for Caravaggio was, for the young Fetti, an impetus towards expressing the happy individuality by which Venice was now to benefit and which reached its greatest heights in Venice itself.

In Mantua he had taken advantage of the Venetian experience gained from the study of the masters who had preceded him in Venice, particularly of Peter Paul Rubens whose influence was still strong. It is enough to mention the Trinity still preserved in Mantua, and especially the Transfiguration now in Nancy, to see the similarity between Rubens' work and the best of Fetti's. Although Fetti had little genius for this kind of work, the Apostles in the Ducal Palace and a fresco in the apse of the Cathedral are marked by light and shade such as we see in Tintoretto's work, rich in shadows and a little cold in tone.

To this period which seemed to have thrown off the insipidity evident in the four episodes in the life of Christ which are in the Corsini collection, we must add the charming Sleeping Girl in Budapest, prototype of all Italian work in this style, down to Amorosi, Todeschini and Piazzetta; the David in Dresden, the whole figure, and the three-quarter figure in the Accademia in Venice which was attributed

to Liss in the old inventories; the Moses and the Burning Bush, the St. Margaret in Vienna; and the beautiful Melancholy, variously treated in the open and indoors: works finely conceived if a little heavy and crude and still not without a touch of mannerism which the Venetians must have found in the works of the Bassano from whom clearly, through Orazio Borgianni, it was derived. Above all, the artist, curious about life and sensitive, lacked that classic harmonious rhythm which had been shattered by the reforms of Caravaggio, and this gives the composition in his altar-pieces and large paintings a certain hesitating quality.

This is emphasized in the mass of detail found in the oval window representing the Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes in the Ducal Palace in Mantua. The drawing of the group of the Faithful is excellent, but on the other hand, in the central group of Christ and the Apostles, the artist, unable to find inspiration in himself or in his subject, has painted figures that are empty and meaningless. Even the best work bears witness to this reaction which came over all European art.

In Venice, where he was no longer obliged to do complicated and gigantic paintings which were not of his genius, he was able to do the work that most appealed to him. The official world did not know him; he lived more in the past than in the present; the ruling mannerists could neither understand nor appreciate him. He worked beside Liss, a young man as lonely as himself of whom we shall speak later on, and Pietro Muttoni, better known as Della Vecchia who was, like a magpie, more attracted by the novelty than as a true lover of art: and above all he was surrounded by men of good taste.

He no longer worked for churches and palaces. At the most he would not refuse to paint a head of Christ, to gratify some priest, such as the Ecce Homo in Lendinara, or the Magdalene in the Doria collection, sacred pictures which he repeated several times, as was the custom then. Copies which are nearly always originals, although in the preceding century they would have been copies in the literal sense of the word. In the same way those sketches of the seventeenth century are originals and not the work of Titian, Veronese and Tintoretto, who never made sketches. For Titian one complete drawing had been sufficient for the whole work of St. Peter the Martyr, and for Paolo Veronese and his followers a black and white drawing was enough. A method adopted by Rubens from the first: he advocated real sketches, when he wanted a work put through quickly by his pupils and often relied too much upon these. It was not until the eighteenth century that artists worked from a small model which had to be as perfect as the completed work.

Domenico Fetti, freed from embarrassment in Venice, began with a greater verve and with better results than he could have achieved in Rome or Mantua to paint

easel-pieces. He was led to this type of work by his natural bent and by the influence of foreign art. For him, and for Carlo Saraceni, a typical small artist of the Rhineland served as a model: Adam Elsheimer of Frankfort (18th March 1578 - 11th December 1610) whose art shows the technique of the Flemish school and who, in his intentions a follower of Caravaggio, was of prime importance as much in Rome where he died, as in Holland where he introduced through Lastmann, Rembrandt's master, the new style of Merisi.

The little rural scenes in the form of parables, so dear to the reformers, and painted on tablets, a method always favoured by the northern artists who preferred wood to canvas, became his favourite themes and those small works dating from his Mantua days, which we see so often in the catalogues of the old Venetian collections, supplied the paintings in Leningrad and are numerous in Dresden and Vienna. It was an unexpected light that dawned, as if a Iacopo Bassano were reborn enriched with all the human qualities of Caravaggio, the humour of Brueghel and the luminous landscapes of Elsheimer, and who, speaking with freshness and pungency, was to inspire a new spirit in the City of the Lagoons, at least for those who could understand its merits at the time and for those who later were almost compelled to understand it, while its value is shown by the increasing interest of the eighteenth century in Fetti's work. It was then that Monaco executed his engraving of the little Tobias with his miraculous fish which Francesco Guardi took as a model for his marvellous works painted for the organ in San Raffaele.

The painting of the Martyrdom of St. Agnes in Dresden, with its soft purple colouring and diffused light, recalls the homely country works of Paolo Veronese, and we see again the latter's architectonic backgrounds in the Prodigal Son in Vienna. In the Flight into Egypt, he is an Elsheimer who paints a landscape with all the romantic quality which Tintoretto gave to the background in his St. Mary of Egypt and his Magdalene at San Rocco, although generally Bassano's influence is the most evident and can sometimes be traced back to a definite derivation as in the Parable of the Lost Sheep formerly in the collection of Baron Hadeln in Venice, almost an exact copy of Tamar and Judah (No. 418 in the Venetian Academy). It
Plate 5 resembles closely the other beautiful work in Dresden, and no one who has seen it can doubt its authenticity.

In all these scenes, sacred and profane, there is a new vein of poetry. We have the interior of a house with the effect of moonlight in the Lost Piece of Silver; a small narrow street, in light and shadow, in the Wicked Servant; a bend in the road in the Labourers in the Vineyard, and in the parables in Dresden he
Plate 6 has painted a rocky landscape which brings trouble to the rash Blind Men but

cheers the Good Samaritan. A part of the sad Venetian Ghetto is depicted in the Pearl of Great Price in Vienna. He paints the world in little, the pathetic and the contemptible clear-cut; work that would not have been acceptable to art in Rome before Caravaggio had ennobled it in that city, the very centre of the most respected rhetoric.

In the same way the florid nudes after the manner of Titian in the picture at Vienna of Leander mourned by Tritons and Naiads, against a background of stormy sea and troubled sky, acquire a candour and an unexpected loveliness that are deeply touching.

Velasquez must have taken this direct from the artist's portraits, as we can see by looking attentively at that of the actor Giovanni Gabrielli. The original is in Leningrad, maintained on a scale of sobre yet vivid greys; and there is a good copy in Venice, which proves that it was painted in that city. It was probably done for the Casa Contarini, a house that welcomed seventeenth-century art. The great Spanish artist went to Venice for the first time in 1629 and returned again in 1648-52. His first visit was for study, but on his second he was to impart his knowledge. *Plate 7*

Before coming to Fetti we should have mentioned, as belonging to the new school, Carlo Saraceni, called the Venetian, firstly because he belonged to Venice and the atmosphere of his native city permeates all his paintings; but also because he died amongst the lagoons not in 1625 but in 1620, as I was the first to establish on the basis of the funeral oration written by Father Maurizio Moro. This date is confirmed by recent research. His death occurred on the 16th June and he was then in his fortieth year. Most of his life from 1592 had been spent in Rome during the Papacy of Clement VII; and there he was a follower of Camillo Mariani of Vicenza, a sculptor of the school of Alessandro Vittoria, and a painter of some merit who influenced Bernini to whom he gave not only a feeling for landscape in the Palladio style but also for pictorial sculpture. We do not know exactly in what year Saraceni returned to Venice; but we know that his principal work in Rome, the Miracle of San Benone for the Chiesa dell'Anima, was not finished before the year 1618; so that he cannot have returned to Venice before then.

Carlo Saraceni, who can be regarded as a direct follower of Caravaggio, has a style that resembles in many ways that of Fetti as well as that of Elsheimer, and is strongly linked to both. This connection is much more complex than Voss thought at first, when he attributed to Saraceni some sketches of landscape and figures which are now to be seen in the Pinacoteca in Naples and are most probably works painted in collaboration with Elsheimer. In the same way in other paintings — the Preaching of John the Baptist which is in the Pitti Palace and is

attributed to Tassi — the figures appear to have been painted by Saraceni and the landscape shows the hand of the master Elsheimer.

One cannot over-estimate the importance of these works and of the outlook which gave rise to a new vision in the painting of landscape: it influenced Guercino profoundly and also Domenichino and the Carracci who had lost the tradition of Venetian art which they had followed in their early work, and even further afield it affected the great French masters headed by Claude Lorrain.

Thus there returned again to Venice through the work of a Venetian artist not only memories of Bassano, which are always to be found in Saraceni — from the Rich Glutton in the Capitoline Gallery in Rome to the Adoration of the Magi published by Voss — but also pictorial elements from Venice and Venetia in general, of such a kind that Saraceni is frequently, even by experts, confused with Savoldo. A good influence which is one of the best elements in baroque and not confined to Italy alone. Very little now remains of this last period when he turned for protection to the Contarini degli Scrigni within whose hospitable walls he died — a painting of St. Francis in Padua, a Magdalene in Vicenza which was reproduced for the Contarini and which in that version is now in the Accademia, and the Ecstasy of St. Francis, painted for the church of the Redentore: but there must have been more than these.

Plate 8 At any rate his spirit lived in his disciple Giovanni Le Clerc, originally of Lorraine, who completed the large canvas of the Doge Enrico Dandolo in the Ducal Palace, depicting an episode of the time of the Crusades, and a moving work, the Shipwreck, painted for the villa of the Contarini at Piazzola. This was a source of great importance for artists like Liss and Strozzi who were fighting bravely in Venice, and also for the less ardent like Della Vecchia who, although ready to advocate any new style, showed in his Crucifixion in San Lio that he depended upon the leaders and followed them in his work.

We now come to the gifted German, Giovanni Liss, to whom we have alluded before and whose startling innovations are not even today clearly understood and appreciated, particularly when he is considered side by side with Fetti who preceded him and who was his master — a point specially noted by Sandrart who knew him.

He, however, surpassed his teacher by his delightful genius as a painter and also by the extraordinary versatility which he showed in all his works — a spirit who really lived a century before his time.

He was little known, even starting from his name, which nearly everybody changed into «Lys», pronounced in the Flemish way: that is to say as if it were the German «Leis», an old mistake already sanctioned by Sandrart, whereas

the name «Liss» can be clearly read in two authentic signatures. As to his native land, until the researches made by Peltzer, he was supposed to be from Oldenburg, being thus half Dutch, whereas he really came from Land Oldenburg in Holstein, the Holsacia of his Bambocciata painted in Venice, dated 1621, which is now in the Kunsthalle in Hamburg.

This artist must not be mistaken for a certain Giovanni Liss who in 1622 was at the court of the Archduke Adolph and who at the most could only be his father. At the same time as Giovanni Liss there lived in Venice one Giovanni van der Lys, a follower of Poelenburg, who died in 1650; but our Giovanni Liss, nicknamed Pan, was a disciple of Golzio. Was not the earlier Liss perhaps the painter of the mannerist work «The Bullfight in Piazza San Marco» which, signed and dated, is now in the possession of Dr. H. Schneider at the Hague?

Much indeed is still unknown of this wonderful artist who turned night into day, to whom some think we owe a large painting of the Raising of Tabitha by St. Peter in the Filippini at Fano, attributed in guide books to the Englishman «Louvet», probably a corruption of «Vouet» which suggests to me, as does also the style, that it would be more properly attributed to the Frenchman Simon Vouet, with whom our Giovanni Liss had no connection.

The real «Pan», faithful follower of Fetti, Tintoretto, Titian and Veronese is clearly established by the numerous works mentioned as his by Sandrart and, most of them, identified from the engravings of Monaco and by the signatures. He appears to have been one of the most astonishing geniuses of his time.

He not only overcame, more even than Rubens himself, his early mannerisms and the heavy quality that belongs to his race, but he is one of the most anachronistic artists of the whole seventeenth century, in virtue of the fine rococo style which permeates all his drawings and works, a spirit which makes him seem more akin to Crespi the Bolognese, and to Piazzetta, than to his contemporaries. Just as in the decoration we find that Giovanni da San Giovanni closely resembles Ricci and the great fresco-painters of the eighteenth century. The Venetians, set in their evil ways, did not appreciate him; but he found great admirers in Italy and in Holland, and even the readier spirits in Venice itself, less sluggish than they had been a few decades earlier, felt his influence. In fact his works quickly found a place in the collections of the Grand Dukes of Tuscany as well as in those of Venice and Amsterdam, where they are to be found in the Reynst collection.

They range from fair scenes like the Kermesse at Budapest, formerly in Venice, the Brawl at Innsbruck, mentioned by Sandrart, to a Brothel Scene in Cassel; the subjects are coarse, but the colour and vivacity are wonderful, and the light and

shadows, reminiscent of Caravaggio, have grown softer and are in complete harmony with the colour.

We now come to the last work of the artist — the Satyr and the Peasant (Philadelphia, Widener Collection, formerly in Venice). These are paintings in an almost burlesque style that characterizes the northern spirit, and delights us in the Game of Morra in Cassel and in the various copies of Judith and Holofernes, or in the two paintings of the Prodigal Son (Uffizi and Vienna, Academy), in two copies of Apollo and Marsyas (Venice and Ostronoff Collection in Moscow), in Cain and Abel, formerly in the Cassirer Collection, Hercules at the parting of the ways in the Dresden Gallery, the Sacrifice of Abraham and the Mourning for Abel in the Giovanelli collection: these are all cited by Sandrart and show how much had been learned from Elsheimer in the treatment of landscape. With the weeping Magdalene guided by an angel, which is in the Dresden Gallery, and again in the Finding of Moses which is in the Lille Museum he is a forerunner of Piazzetta, particularly in the position and the drapery and in the bold grouping, like that of the Ladies under a sunshade which is in Dublin.

Plate 9

But Liss understood how to give us more than that in his pictures, which are so complex and so full of movement that they might belong to the eighteenth century or to a more modern period. The Toilet of Venus in the Uffizi, Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane, signed and dated 1629 (?), formerly in Rome in the Iandolo collection, the Ecstasy of St. Paul in Berlin and the St. Jerome in the Tolentini in Venice, which is his masterpiece and of which there is a small sketch in the museum at Vicenza: these are glowing and iridescent in colour, and show us how this German artist had benefited from the teaching of Venice and above all from the technique of Titian in his old age.

Plate 10

And thus through many changes the past was revived.

It was not without good ground that the wise Temanza, in his *Zibaldone* insisted that Liss was the master of Bernardo Strozzi. It cannot really be the case, of course, as the Genoese did not come to Venice before 1630, when he was nineteen, barely in time, if indeed in time, to receive the last words of the master who probably died in that year in which riotous living and plague were rife. It is none the less true that the art of the last of the Renovators reached its height through that gaiety of technique which was his greatest boast, and that both Fetti and Liss, devoted to Rubens, who had captivated Strozzi in Genoa, were the artists who brought it to perfection.

Bernardo Strozzi, more than any of the Renovators whom we have mentioned, was influenced by the mannerists, and his work suffered the more in that he had

nothing of their quality of fantasy; but considered from the point of view of colour, his work can stand beside some of the finest seventeenth-century painting. In good and bad points his work is not unlike that of Frans Hals, although the two never met.

It was on account of his exceptional talent that Strozzi, having escaped from the persecution of the monks, who wanted him back in the convent, became in Venice from 1630 until his death on the 2nd August 1644 in the house of his patron Sagredo, the artist who brought to a close the ardent battles waged by Fetti, Saraceni and Liss, and the conqueror of affectation and baseness.

Thus well protected, this painter, whom the ordinary man found it easier to understand, had come at the right moment to take up the much-contested inheritance, and it is not surprising that he was successful.

His work in Venice began with some orders for the state — two official portraits, one for the Ducal Palace, the other, as was the custom on his nomination, for the family of the elected Doge, in this case Francesco Erizzo who rose to his high position in the year 1631.

We are not going to consider in any detail the time which the master spent in Genoa, when by virtue of his extraordinary talent, the art of Strozzi escaped from the vapid decoration of Bergamasco, a northern Cavalier d'Arpino, from the false, cheap baroque of Salimbeni and of Vanni, and from the mannerism which had been taught in the schools and is to be seen in all the so-called masterpieces of the period. It is enough to acknowledge that the new dawn came to him with Rubens, the followers of Caravaggio, the Flemings and the Lombards. It was like some rich and precious metal, still heavy with dross, to be purified at last by the art of Venice.

Only there, in Venice, could his art achieve the clarity and beauty of colour that are its glory, and it was Liss, that vivid spirit, who handed on to him the torch he had lighted. We need only compare the Genoese Madonna della Pappa with the one in Venice to see what Strozzi had gained from contact with the great German painter, whom he could rapidly and easily understand owing to their common and fundamental devotion to Rubens. *Plate 11*

The engravings of Monaco and Falck are another example of the certain influence of Liss, to which Temanza, Oldenbourg and I myself have drawn attention, and which has recently been further emphasized by Zarnowski's discoveries (*Belvedere* 1925), regarding a painting, «Vanity», represented by an ugly old shrew in front of a mirror, which was at one time in Venice but is now in the State Museum in Moscow. It is a painting by Liss, reproduced almost stroke for stroke by Strozzi in a work in the possession of Dr. Beels in Amsterdam.

Strozzi was the first Italian who showed definitely how much good was to come

from that international outlook in art which was so typical of the seventeenth century; it came from genuine and varied experience and not, like eclecticism, from a *mélange* of settled constituents. In this laborious mixture the example of the great Venetian works could but assist the exceptional sensibility of Strozzi.

During this Venetian period he was not always happy in his compositions, but even so his art benefited greatly in this same field, especially through the influence of Paul Veronese who, in his glowing and impassioned art, had much in common with the Genoese painter.

The traditions of Caravaggio, and markedly of Saraceni, influenced a whole series of Strozzi's works, such as the St. Lawrence of the Tolentini, who is distributing sacred gifts to the poor, and the healing of Tobias, in Leningrad. The Christ with the Tribute Money in the Uffizi and another in Treviso (in the church of Beato Enrico) already show a leaning towards the style of Caliari, and as this influence increases the composition becomes simpler and lighter. In the parable of the Wedding Guest in the church of the Incurabili, of which there are two copies, one in the Uffizi and the other in the Accademia Ligustica in Genoa (1636), the picture is still rather crowded, but the difficult grouping is more skilfully handled, and his growing mastery can be seen in the Preaching of St. John the Baptist in Vienna and in the Annunciation in Budapest, until one marvels at such growth and development in a man of Strozzi's age. His genius culminates in two memorable works, both remarkable for the charming landscapes which are so befitting
Plate 12 to both subjects. The first is the Rape of Europa in Posen, largly inspired by a work of Veronese now in the Ducal Palace, and glowing with all the colour of summer, and the other is the altar-piece of San Benedetto, St. Sebastian with St. Ire-
Plate 13 ne and her companions, where he has achieved the perfect adjustment of figures to background. The background here is thickly wooded, and out of the light and shadow there descends the group of angels, familiar in Veronese's altar-pieces, whose restraint makes the silk and linen and lace of the garments of the praying women more dazzling. The shades of yellow, red and green have the shining quality of lacquer, they seem like the prelude to Tiepolo's works and bring out the wonderful lines of the figure of St. Sebastian, drawn so clearly and so boldly that the eye never wearies of this masterly work.

If Strozzi's work has many of the defects of baroque, these become less and less evident in the painting of his Venetian period, and sometimes, as in this masterpiece, disappear altogether. We see how easily the artist overcame these defects in simple compositions like the Sculpture, in the Libreria Marciana (1635), the David Victorious, subject of an engraving by Monaco, now in the possession of

Baron Auspitz in Vienna, and also the compositions of more than one figure like that at one time in Legnago in the possession of the Maggioni, the Musicians, and a beautiful group now in a gallery in Vienna. These are groups in magnificent garments, their faces all alight with the same passion, the whole breathing an atmosphere half of Giorgione and half of Caravaggio, like the Furies, the Fates and the Theological Virtues in the Casa Donà dalle Rose. The Peace and Justice «*che fece con tutto spirito*», as Temanza tells us, were a penance inflicted by the Apostolic Nuncio on Strozzi for having fled to Genoa. These had all the zest and freshness that his genius gave to this new style.

It was naturally in portrait-painting, of which he has given us such wonderful examples, that with his perfect gift of vision he found most suitable scope for his art. His insight, much superior to that in the Knight of Malta in Milan, which is a wonderful example of his Genoese period and of the Lombard influence, is shown in the portrait of the Doge Erizzo originally in the Ducal Palace, now in Vienna, *Plate 14* painted in his first Venetian years.

To the sparkling spirit of Van Dyck he adds something of the intimacy of Titian, which makes his portraits less striking but at the same time less wearisome. He has lavished technique upon the rich garments of office, but not at the expense of the essential feature — the severity of the sitter's countenance — and he has surpassed himself in the painting of the hands, so living and so well placed. The only portrait painter we can consider with him is Velasquez; but Strozzi never attained the heights of that great master, being inferior to him rather as regards decoration than in interpretation.

Strozzi's genius was bound to make its mark in any field of art and, surrounded by painters who had cast off all tradition, he gave us works which must be considered as masterpieces and as establishing fundamental laws for the painting of the full-length figure. The lifesize portrait of the Procurator Grimani, now in the Palazzo Barbaro in Venice, stirred the world to an intelligent appreciation of its grandeur and its worth.

This progress in painting is seen to better advantage in his less pompous, non-official work like the painting, probably of an engineer, decorative in the best sense in its easy poise, which I identified in Verona, where it is attributed to Ribera, and in the Sleeping Child in the Czernin Gallery in Vienna (I do not propose *Plate 15* to consider the copy in Grenoble), where the delightful child, all pink and white, is relaxed in peaceful sleep, while in startling contrast to that first childhood there is a half-length portrait of an Old Woman in a private collection in Florence, painted *Plate 16* with no attempt at flattery but with a power which foreshadows Goya and pre-

pares the way for the better Venetian art of the eighteenth century. We come to the end of the list of Strozzi's masterpieces with one which is thought to be a portrait of the artist. He is dressed in priestly vestments (Monsignore died at peace with the Church and with men) and holds a missal in his hand — it is dated 1643, hardly a year before his death: Don Abbondio, prosperous, mild, Spanish-looking, as he has been immortalized by Manzoni in «*I Promessi Sposi*». It is a marvellous work and was at one time offered for sale in Paris — a picture touching in its simplicity.

What are we to make of the portrait given with such presumption by Ratti in his Lives of Genoese Artists — a gross mistake on the part of the Ligurian biographer, which he took from Soprani who gives an engraving by Simon Vouet of another Strozzi whom the French artist visited in Venice about 1627 before returning to France. Our Genoese was not there at the time. This is the Tuscan poet, Giulio Strozzi, who was famous among the lagoons for the poem he dedicated to the City of the Doges, the same Strozzi we see again painted by Tinelli.

We cannot close this chapter without mentioning a lesser artist, not such a great genius but pleasing in his style, whom we can place amongst those who followed the reforms of Caravaggio — Niccolò Regnier, called Renieri in Venice where he quickly settled down. He was famous not only for his painting but also because of his beautiful daughters, amateurs of art, one of whom married Daniel Van Dyck and another Pietro Vecchia.

Born in Maubeuge in 1590 (?), he went to the local school and then to Rome, where it is said he became acquainted with Manfredi; but I should say that it is more likely that he made the acquaintance of his compatriot Simon Vouet. His work is a little like that of Turchi and of Stroiffi in his early paintings. We shall speak of these two artists later. The lifeless but noble figures of Vouet become more lifeless still with Renieri, especially during the time he spent in Venice where he worked with his step-brother Michele Desubleo, a declared follower of Guido Reni (Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane, in the Church of San Zaccaria; the Virgin and Saints in the Scalzi; the Martyrdom of St. Lawrence, originally in the church of the same name, and now belonging to the Minisini family; St. John the Baptist in the Sacristy of the Eremitani in Padua). The influence of Bolognese artists is always evident in the works of Renieri specially in the altar-pieces of San Luca and Santa Teresa, in the Annunciation in the Accademia and in the Baptism in San Salvatore. He only retained the better teaching of Vouet in the detached figures and the unobtrusive groups; but his work is washed out and insipid, as for example in the
Plate 17a St. Sebastian, not yet attributed to him, in the Castello Sforzesco in Milan, in the group of «The Letter» and in the Magdalene in the collection of Duke Camerini

in Piazzola, also identified by me, and in the Sibyl in the Venice Academy and in the Saint in the museum at Padua. *Plate 17 b*

Renieri died on the 19th of November 1667, having left all his property, in his will of November 2nd, duly recorded by the notary Camillo Lin, to his daughters and his half-brother (*Arch. di Stato*, Venice, Sez. Not. B 591, no. 125).

The period of revolution in painting was over, and Venice returned to tradition in art with all the fervour of a convert.

Much had yet to be done before she regained her former glory, but the first great step was taken when Venice escaped at last from the baneful curse of mannerism.

Carlo Ridolfi in publishing in 1648 *Le Meraviglie dell'Arte* ignored the Renovators; but they could no longer be disregarded — they had conquered, although Ridolfi was too old-fashioned to recognize this. Twelve years later, Marco Boschini, a writer of much better judgement, mentioned them very favourably in the *Carta del Navegar Pitoresco* and also in the famous guides to Venice and Vicenza.

Firstly there were the disciples of the new masters or at least of some of them. Venice no longer knew Fetti and Liss, but after the death of Carlo Saraceni there remained Giovanni Le Clerc, a native of Nancy, in Lorraine, who was born about 1588 and died in 1633. His name stands on the large painting in the Ducal Palace, which was certainly painted, at least in part, by Saraceni himself. A work, bright in colour and rather crowded, which must nevertheless have created a sensation at the time, in its novelty and gusto, despite the emphatic style. Le Clerc is also the author of a painting of a wreck, in the Villa of the Duca Camerini in Piazzola which once belonged to the Contarini, the patrons of Saraceni. Le Clerc's fame was also acknowledged in countries beyond Italy.

It must be recalled at this point that Maximilian of Bavaria had had a prayer book illuminated with illustrations from Saraceni (the Flight in Camaldoli; Assumption of an unknown type, etc.) and that Maximilian had sent to the school of the master in Venice the painter Ulrich Loth, the father of the Carlo whom we shall find amongst the best of those who revived the pictorial art of the Lagoons. But these artists were of the moment only, and made no mark once the master was dead. Of Le Clerc's work we know nothing later than the painting in the Ducal Palace, and of Loth only that by 1624 he had already returned to his own country.

This was not the case with Strozzi, who had stayed so long in Venice and was there at the right moment, becoming therefore the most convincing of the Renovators. In the first place, he was followed in his fruitful exile by a faithful fellow-citizen, Giovanni Francesco Cassana (1611-1690) who lived and worked for a long time in Venice, handing on to his sons, and particularly to Giambattista Langetti, the delicacy in colour we see in the large oval windows in the church of Santa Giustina in Padua, where he has painted Abraham and the Angels, and Nadab and Abihu, and in the St. Martin on horseback in the Pinacoteca of Bologna. He died at Mirandola at the court of Alexander Pico II, into whose service he had passed in his old age.

New tradition, and with it a new faith, established itself step by step. It was most marked in Venetia, where Strozzi's most faithful follower was Ermanno Stroiffi, a

native of Padua, who was born in 1616 and died on July 4th 1693 at the age of 77, as is recorded in the documents. His first picture, painted at the age of nine, showed in its strength and quality that he was already a master: this, of course, if we can rely on the date, 1625, on the altar-piece of the Ospedaletto in Venice which is certainly his work.

On the other hand this picture, even if of later date, suffices to show us what were Stroiffi's artistic origins, and Strozzi was not yet one of them. The work shows rather the influence of the schools with which he must have come in contact in his travels, as they are recorded by Boschini, and most clearly the influence of Caravaggio. There is something of the Venetian manner rather like that of Bassano in the group of angels crowning the Virgin, but in the Virgin herself and in the Saints we find a Roman style which, with its Venetian interpretation, might be that of the Veronese Alessandro Turchi, called Orbetto, or of Giovanni Carboncino, who belonged either to Treviso or to Venice: all of whom resemble one another in giving to the schemes of Caravaggio an empty and artificial character.

Strozzi therefore did not have to convert a mannerist, but had only to guide one who had already escaped from the influence of that school and whose genius was more than willing to accept the truth. And the profound change in Stroiffi's work, under this guidance, is of the greatest interest. *Plate 18*

The altar-piece, La Pietà, in the church of the Filippini in Padua, shows how much his style altered. It was painted for the congregation which he founded when he was ordained in 1647 and became a follower of Neri, both in Genoa and in Venice. His work is so much dominated by Strozzi both in the composition, in the types he has portrayed and in the technique, that we should ascribe it to that master if we did not know for certain that it was the work of Stroiffi, who had by then become the favourite disciple of the Genoese.

On looking at this painting closely, we notice a certain lack of strength which is never found in the master's work — a weakness that is almost effeminate. The colouring is harder, sometimes almost as crude as that of Renieri. These points are easy to see now that we can make the distinction, hitherto unsuspected, between the two artists. Without that knowledge we should still attribute to Strozzi paintings such as the Salome in the Museo Civico in Padua, and many others which are faithful *Plate 19* copies of his subjects but lack his strength. In the convent of La Fava, in Venice, are six small paintings depicting Miracles of San Filippo Neri, which Stroiffi painted in his later years; they are finer and show a tendency towards that comeliness of the preceding century which was so right and fitting to this *genre*. And in portrait-painting, as in that of religious subjects, he shows the same discreet tendency.

Plate 20 There is a good example in Vienna, in the possession of Dr. Kieslinger; it is of a Brother of the Order of the Filippini, perhaps a self-portrait of the artist.

While Stroiffi was loyal and restrained, Sebastiano Mazzoni was bold and tempestuous. A native of Florence, exiled as a young man through false accusations, he came in his early youth to Venice and there enjoyed the teaching of Strozzi without any other baneful influence (1615-1685 c.). Painter and architect, architect and poet, it was he who designed the Palazzo Moro-Lin, built for Liberi. In one word, this versatile Tuscan was a true genius of the seventeenth century, in art and in spirit. His fame today is confined to a few pictures — few, but all noteworthy — which mark him as one of the most original successors to those foreigners who had cleansed Venetian art of its abominable mannerism, and who were to give back to Italian art the supremacy it had formerly enjoyed.

There are paintings in San Benedetto on the two doors at the sides of the presbytery, which are always quoted in the guide books — one shows the patron saint, accompanied by the Cardinal Virtues and by St. John the Baptist, with Faith bearing a Chalice upon which the painter's signature is visible, and the other St. Benedict recommending a priest to the Virgin: the latter leaves no doubt as to how much he derives from Strozzi. But to have a true idea of this painter's achievement we must leave Venice where, apart from these two works, nothing of his remains — neither the paintings of San Trovaso executed with the help of his disciple Niccolò Bambini, and spoilt by a Roman prettiness, nor those of San Giobbe. The Crucifixion in the Serviti has also been destroyed. Temanza says that the painting had atmosphere but that the touch is too light and things are airy and illusory; and the poor arrangement of the Vision of a Pope at the Carmini does not make us regret the loss. Fully to appreciate his quality one must see the Cleo-
Plate 21 patra dying amidst the sorrow of her handmaidens, which is in the Accademia dei Concordi in Rovigo, typical of his iridescent colour and his brush-work, and sug-
Plate 22 gestive of Rembrandt in lighter mood; and the painting of the Finding of Moses, mentioned by Bartoli, of which there is a copy in Berlin — a characteristic work which shows a taste for landscape, which Travi also derived from Strozzi in Liguria; but with him the quality is more spirited, almost like that of Magnasco.

It is specially in considering the above work and the glittering portrait of a
Plate 23 pompous Rodomonte in the museum at Padua that we can understand that Mazzoni was not only the none too fecund master of the stiff Bambini but also of the superficial Celesti and of the clamorous Fumiani. He was also, more so than the frivolous Federico Cervelli, the unforeseen but worthy and comprehensible inaugurator of the style adopted by Sebastiano Ricci, and thus indirectly inspired the

latter's nephew Marco: that is to say he was the master of the two leaders of the eighteenth century. And this is Temanza's opinion, at least as regards Sebastiano, recalling the gratitude he showed to the master and the love and care he had for his widow whom he buried with every respect.

As soon as Venetian art had fought its way out of the swamps of mannerism, there was evidence of the first blossoming of a new school.

Disciples came from all quarters, even from amongst the mannerists whose teaching, once so pernicious, had no attraction now for the younger artists, who had a longing for the traditions of the past which opened to them new worlds of art.

Tiberio Tinelli (1586-1638) a follower of Contarini and a superficial imitator of Titian remains famous for the honour paid to him as an imitator of Antonio Van Dyck. But this is to overrate him unless we continue to ascribe to him the double portrait in the Galleria Capitolina, and unles, we bear in mind that this and similar paintings do not really belong to the painter of the figure among the ruins, signed in full and now in the Fuller collection in New York, which by its cold dignity suggests a painter earlier than Forabosco or Bombelli, while the quality of the painting is that of a follower of Leandro Bassano. The work is very like, in its good points and in its defects, the portrait of Giulio Strozzi in the Uffizi long attributed to Tinelli, though without proof. Only the groups of figures in the background, in the American picture, show signs of the new manner of Fetti; the colour is that of Strozzi. *Plate 24*

Another very typical example of reform, if not of complete return to tradition, is seen in the paintings of Filippo Zaniberti, a native of Brescia where he was born in 1585; he was a disciple of Peranda, a friend of the inveterate mannerist, Matteo Ponzone. During his short life — he died in Venice in 1636, in his fifty-second year — he was able to withstand, better than any other artist of the day, the impact of the prevailing mannerism, and he succeeded in painting in a manner that was a kind of compromise between the old and the new. And he achieved all that was possible with that confused and ambiguous blend of style.

He resembles, more closely than any other Venetian artist, those from the provinces who had come to the City of the Lagoons looking for help and only half achieving their end. In the scene in the Quarantia Civil Nova in the Ducal Palace — Truth discovered by Time — and in the Banquet of the Doge Cornaro, now in the Accademia, in the altar-piece in the Duomo at Sebenico, the composition is a blend of the traditional manner of Tintoretto and Veronese, but the colour — delicate but vivacious — shows the influence of Strozzi. *Plate 25*

The large figures are ethereal in their elusive colour and have little expression.

The large and bewildered eyes and the women's wealth of hair adorned with pearls are characteristic. His work is confusingly like that of Valerio Castello in the Rinaldo and Armida in the old Picture Gallery in Munich, and Furini in some types of the Graces in the National Gallery in London. One thinks of the internationalism in art of which I have spoken, but the signs are even more of international weakness — weakness, however, which art might well hope to overcome.

Plate 26
Plate 27

The works of Zaniberti were not only pleasing but had value in their results: I believe that unlike the much younger and more gifted artist Francesco Maffei, a native of Vicenza, his sympathy for the Renovators was particularly and naturally effective. Zaniberti must have known Maffei in the school of Santo Peranda where they both studied and where Maffei showed great promise. It was certainly on account of his undoubted contact with this artist, once well known as a mannerist, who died in 1638 and whose inheritance he assumed by finishing Peranda's paintings at the Tolentini and at the Incurabili, that we must conclude that Maffei was born a little before 1625, as recorded in the registers of Padua, which I have published. In these it is said that he died from plague (and this cannot be questioned) on July 2nd 1660, when he was only 35.

The intricate and laboured manner of his master, who had tried to follow Tintoretto, now sat lightly upon Maffei who no longer plundered the past but looked upon it as the best of teaching. He shows his respect for tradition in the beautiful copies he made of the work of Veronese, the Adoration of the Magi in the Duomo in Vicenza, and of Titian in the small picture of the Martyrdom of St. Peter in the Museum (No. 75), which I attributed to him before the signature which proves its authorship was discovered. The colour is so lovely that it might well be thought to be a sketch from the hand of the master, if we did not know that this was not the method of the sixteenth century.

To this period, still in bondage to the past, belongs the painting of the Last Supper in the rather eccentric manner of Tintoretto, in the museum in Verona.

The wild fantasies of his great predecessor served as a model in this work; but in the other works in Vicenza, which we may conveniently take together although they belong to different years, that fantastic imagination was only an incitement to new experiment and invention, in which there are certainly traces of Tintoretto's mighty power of invention.

There we find the Legend of St. Nicholas, the four paintings in honour of the Venetian governors, which are in the Museo Civico, and the Trinity in the Church of the Servi — to mention only the best known. We can add the paintings to the glory of the Virgin in the Rotonda and the Pietà in the Municipio of Rovigo, and

two works in Brescia, a procession in the Duomo Vecchio and a Miracle of St. Anthony in San Francesco. They show imaginative power, a new mastery in composition, a decorative quality and a gorgeous and dazzling colour handled with a new verve, that looks as if Veronese were at work again, with the added experience of the seventeenth-century restorers of tradition.

There is a suggestion of Rubens in this work, in which, as in that of Domenico Fetti, there are also traces of mannerism in the abitrary handling of proportion; but, although the drawing of the figures is often out, the feeling and sincerity is attractive. There is a play of light and shade in the cloudy skies with patches of brilliant blue, and in the bright red dresses of the servants beside the grave magistrates, as in the Glorification of Alvise Foscari in Vicenza. In the Melchizedek (in the Palazzo Widman in Venice), a dishevelled old man dressed in bluish garments is *Plate 28* enveloped in the smoke of the sacrifice; and the curiosity of Sarah at Abraham's meeting with the Angels, under the solemn Trinity in Vicenza, gives vividly that love of contrast and the incongruity which is the heart of the baroque. They show us that Maffei had a genius of the first order, ready to avail itself of all experience.

This Vicenza artist, once his youthful ardour had abated, would certainly have achieved more, had he not died just as recognition was coming to him. The few pictures that remain of the many lost in Padua, belonging to his last period, leave no doubt as to this: Moses on Mount Sinai in Santa Giustina and especially the Adoration of the Magi which hangs over the organ of the Filippini, similar to the picture of Elijah visited by the Angel in Berlin which at one time was attributed to *Plate 30* Fetti, are restful works where the grouping of the figures is beautiful, and the wonderful delicate colouring, harmonious in every stroke of the brush, foreshadows the delightful colour of the eighteenth century. These qualities have led even to the attribution of his Salome in the museum at Faenza to Tiepolo. *Plate 29*

All these experiences, which came not only from abroad but also from Venice, all these struggles, would not have availed had the work not been established on a sound traditional basis, which it owed to the pertinacity of Padovanino, and had the artists not been eager to hear the new teaching.

In this new teaching both the good and the less worthy artists found a refuge, and their work, even when its boldness was not appreciated, was not despised.

Pietro Liberi, born on the 15th April 1614, a native of Padua like his master, comes first. He is, in his art and in his life, typical of the seventeenth century and of those adventurers who were so numerous in the eighteenth. He was in turn a soldier, a merchant and a slave in Tunis: freed, he travelled continually between Malta and Sicily, Naples and Tuscany, went to France, Spain and finally Germany,

where he became court painter and a man of influence, enjoying honour and wealth. Temanza, who is usually well informed, tells us that his wealth grew on account of his being able to counterfeit jewels in a marvellous way, a talent which greatly displeased the God-fearing Zanetti.

But time looks kindly on such ugly practices, and at least we can say that he used his wealth to promote art. The Palazzo Moro-Lin on the Grand Canal in Venice, designed by Sebastiano Mazzoni, was built to his order. It was in this palace that Liberi died on the 18th December 1687. He used his influence to found a college of painters which separated itself from the Fraglia and developed on broader and less severe lines. His painting was easy and clever, but not of the finest quality. He painted fleshy, ruddy figures, like those of Titian reduced to a mere formula, and influenced slightly in his grouping of figures and in his use of ornament by Correggio. His large groups of bloated, naked figures with full bovine eyes, painted with careless speed and showing lack of taste and reticence, no longer appeal to us, although at the time they were much admired and sought after. He is acknowledged to have influenced the use of colour, in Venice, by increasing its range to a wide gamut of gay tinctures which, after a long struggle, was accepted. But although the colour was bright it lacked real brilliance and suggested tapestry rather than painting.

We have no work of this artist, who appears to us like an insipid Pietro da Cortona, that can in any way be compared with the decoration of the Palazzo Barberini in Rome or of the Palazzo Pitti in Florence. The most famous ceiling
Plate 31 of Liberi is that in the sacristy of Saint Anthony in Padua. It is heavy with a weight of detail which demands a loftier building, while the intertwined figures are unconfined by rules of perspective or by the cornices which Berrettini would have treated as a frame to give a sense of distance to the restricted space.

The artist was more successful in his altar-pieces than in this overcrowded ceiling: the glory of St. Anthony and the Annunciation in S. Maria della Salute, the Sermon of St. Francis Xavier at the Gesuiti — sometimes wrongly ascribed by the guide books to Strozzi — are good examples of his work; and there are some others like the boldly painted Brazen Serpent in San Pietro in Castello. There are also the mythological subjects, like the Diana and Actæon in Berlin and the fat and immodest Venuses. He enjoyed painting the sensual rather than the chaste, and his son Marco repeated and varied the same kind of subject with obvious plagi-
Plate 32 arism and even more marked enjoyment: the Jupiter and Mnemosyne in Budapest bears his signature.

The art of Pietro Muttoni, called Pietro Vecchia, is slyer and less pretentious.

He was born in Venice in 1605, and related to Renieri through his marriage with the latter's daughter, Clorinda. Unable to put new spirit into the traditions left by Padovanino, he resorted to clever imitation and even to cowardly shamming. Ridolfi took his pseudo-Giorgionesque work seriously in paintings like the Warrior in Dresden and the Resurrection in San Francesco della Vigna, and in the *Plate 33* Christ and the Tribute Money in the Accademia, but these are, rather, servile copies of the style of Romanino — baroque, even in the sixteenth century (Romanino's real work can be seen in the Benson Resurrection, — and Luca Giordano's — still more dangerous as a model in his chameleon-like versatility and modern rashness — in the Shepherd with a flute in the Gallery in Naples). Boschini, however, took the matter as a joke, and we are compelled to smile even more, when we find not altogether unpleasant, but always lacking in strength, certain mixtures of the old and new styles such as the Young Girl at Karlsruhe — a Venetian *Plate 34* rendering of a similar picture by his father-in-law Renieri in the manner of Vouet. Even when the artist wishes to adopt a more genuine style, he veers from one model to another, imitates — almost copying — Saraceni in the Crucifixion in San Lio, the shadows of Caravaggio in the Hercules in Brunswick, and the manner of Fetti in some heads, painted on wood, which are now scattered through a number of galleries and often attributed to the most inappropriate painters. He is still clumsy and faulty in the altar-piece, so much praised by Zanetti, formerly in Santa Giustina and now in the Accademia in Venice, representing the patron Saint surrounded by others, and an angel, clothed in white, offering her a skull, and even in certain *genre* pictures foreshadowing a little the type of work of Todeschini and Amorosi, such as the Old Woman with three children in Dresden. His work however can always be recognized, despite all the disguises, by the incurably squinting, empty, staring, senseless eyes of his personages.

Pietro Vecchia, and Liberi, whom he preceded to the grave by ten years in 1678, are the two most barren followers of Varotari; art is lost in their superficiality on the one hand and their counterfeiting on the other, but time has rendered honour where honour was not due, and they remain the most noted of his followers.

But the teaching of Padovanino deserved, as does all honest teaching, better results, and he was rewarded in the work of two of his disciples — Gerolamo Forabosco and the Venetian Giulio Carpioni. Faithful to tradition and enamoured of the past, they modified their devotion in the light of their new experience and were no mere slavish imitators.

Gerolamo Forabosco is in every way a true disciple of Padovanino. He was probably born, like his master, in Padua, about the year 1604 or 1605, and he

died there, as I have proved, on the 23rd of January 1679. He founded a school which produced much honest work and looked askance at all glib facility. From this school came Gregorio Lazzarini who was the first, if not the most inspiring, master of Giambattista Tiepolo.

He, like Vecchia, began with small paintings of historical subjects, like the Eumenes and Roxana which was shown in the Berlin exhibition in 1927 (Wertheim): a picture similar to that in the Hermitage at Leningrad in which Varotari, under the influence of the Restorers, had attempted an unusual composition. I saw recently in Padua, in the collection of Zamatto, the antiquary, two pendants inspired by Bernardo Strozzi's Cook in Genoa, and the Fruitseller in Mantua: one of these was Varotari's Herbseller with a boy and the other Forabosco's Seller of Fish accompanied by a woman.

In such works the disciple was but little better than his master and in his treatment of groups he had not even the same skill, as is proved by the grouping in the Orlando, Rodomonte and Fiordiligi, which appears in collections, and in the unpleasant Lot and his daughters in Berlin, which delighted the seventeenth century. The simplicity of the pictures of St. Francis comforted by an angel and of San Magno Vescovo in the Tolentini is the more delightful despite the affectation. They are amongst the few sacred pictures left by the artist who avoided, as far as he could, over-elaborate composition, to which he could not devote all the diligence which was so dear to him and which led him, as Canal tells us in his Life of Lazzarini (Venice, 1809), to spend so long over his works that he could never bring himself to part with them.

His colour is exquisite and rich in tone, and his less-assured manner was better in single figures and in simple poses like that of the David in the Liechtenstein Gallery, simple almost to the point of affectation. There are two replicas of this, one in Bologna, and the other in Trento: the latter half-nude, the former clothed in a wonderful blue and white coat and a cloak patterned in a golden yellow which harmonizes delightfully with the glowing locks of the youthful hero. This work shows something of the teaching of Albani, whose influence meets that of Padovanino in Forabosco's work and the type of face he has depicted suggests Tiarini. The Venetian technique added a warmth to his work, and with its experience gives animation to the whole, while the hands are worthy of Strozzi and the head of Goliath has the exquisite quality of Liss and of Titian. (*Oretti, De' Pittori Bolognesi*, MS. Bologna, B. Comunale, V. 58).

Plate 35

In portrait-painting, which he preferred, Forabosco found his natural province and there achieved a serenity which in Vecchia and so many of his contemporaries

had been so much disturbed. I base this assertion on the picture of the Shipwreck in the church of Malamocco, which Boschini only mentioned in the second edition of *Ricche Minere*, and which therefore must have been painted between 1664 and 1674. It is typical of the artist's later period, as the Seller of Fish is of his earlier period, before the death of Padovanino. They make a very living group of portraits and show the painter's wide and varied experience. *Plate 36*

Thus the art of Bologna merged itself with that of Venice in these types of noblemen, ladies and children that recall Cittadini; a type that Voss compares to the so-called «Canonico dei Carracci» in Lyons and that is predominant in the Malamocco picture where the artist is still preoccupied with the composition and has made use of everything he gained from this school. But when he found in portrait-painting, where he had to deal with only one or two figures, that all these rules were less necessary, he gladly gave himself again to the true tradition, remembering the fine abundant colour of Bernardo Strozzi and the power of Velasquez, who after 1648, returned, as I have said, to Venice heralded by fame that was both flattering and well deserved.

This longing for tradition, however, does not prevent my recognizing various influences, sometimes that of Lorenzo Lotto, as in the pompous Judith with the head of Holofernes which I saw recently in a shop, offered under a greater name but in reality nothing more than a variation of the Holford portrait in the National Gallery in London, sometimes that of Palma, as in the Two Sisters of the Castello Sforzesco; while there is an imitation of Titian in the Wildenstein collection, declared by well-known critics to be the work of Vecellio (Talleyrand Sale, Paris, 1899). Similarly I could not be led by the slight Spanish touch in the «Menichina Padovana» in the Corsini Gallery in Rome to confuse it with the work of Velasquez. The correction will not safeguard the unwary, but I have succeeded in having the name of the Paduan restored to the charming half-figure of a woman in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna where it had been attributed to the exotic Coello. In this case I was, I must confess, greatly helped by its being mentioned in a contemporary document — an inventory of the collection of the Duca Guglielmo, made in 1652! This portrait is a key to many others in the Uffizi and in many European collections. *Plate 37* *Plate 38* *Plate 39*

This is a link between the portrait-painting of the sixteenth century and that of the eighteenth in works which, on the one hand are in advance of their time, and on the other represent stages in the return to an art that was again becoming honourable and distinguished.

What Forabosco had done for colour and for the revival of the past, Giulio

Carpioni did for design. Born in Venice in 1611, he had gained from Padovanino an insight into Titian's work and especially his profane Bacchanals. But in his treatment of the old themes there is none of the master's heavy ornament, which many of his fellow-disciples continued to adopt. His taste for engraving had taught him to draw in a clear-cut manner. This catholic taste allowed him to tackle with ease the most widely differing subjects and to learn something from the most varied experiences, so that he could easily adopt the manner of artists either of the old or the new school, if they had in common with him a reverence for the great sixteenth-century master.

Giulio was for Venice a later Poussin. A convinced neo-Venetian, he saw Titian through the changes wrought by Caravaggio, carried by precise delineation to the exaggeration in which the empty formula accepted by the group of Lombard Venetians and by those of Brescia such as Moretto, Moroni and Savoldo had resulted.

The contemporary Pietro Testa was the intermediary in these complicated relationships and the link, as I have said, was the engraving. In the caprices of Carpioni we are constantly aware of these contacts which become frequent enough to amount to plagiarism and, naturally, they accentuate the connection with the great founder of the French school, to whom Testa had been a kind of interpreter. The plagiarism is more evident, although less intimate, in certain works derived from Simone Cantarini of Pesaro, one of the most subtle of the designers of the Bolognese school and a follower of Guido Reni, with, however, a strong sympathy for Vecellio. He too was a contemporary of Carpioni. They probably met at Verona where they both died — Cantarini, as a young man in 1648, and Carpioni in 1674.

In the twenty-six engravings described by Bartsch (XX, 178, 191), we see the artist really heralding the eighteenth century in his nervous drawing, in the placing of the figures, especially in his secular subjects where the influence of others is less marked, one of whom, Odoardo Fialetti of Bologna, an imitator of Tintoretto and of Veronese, is even a mannerist. The Dancing Boys and the Four Elements are clearly subjects that inspired the engravings of Giambattista Tiepolo, who in this way caught something of Padovanino's design, just as through the Genoese Castiglione he will catch something of the fantastic air of the art of Rembrandt.

Amongst his many gifts, however, Carpioni lacked the sense of colour and was content to paint in dull flat tones which were probably inspired by Ruschi, whom we shall consider shortly. He only modifies the flesh tints by using darker colour in painting men and lighter in painting women. He spoils all his figures by using the reddish preparation of the background which is so typical of the eighteenth century and which now, through time, can be seen beneath the paler colours that

had less body. They are interesting, although questionable, purely from the point of view of colour and Venetian tradition.

Carpioni painted very few sacred subjects: he was fond of small decorative design, and disliked composition on a larger scale. Of all his pictures mentioned in the early guide books to Verona, I do not believe one remains, and in Vicenza there is only the grandiose painting above the high altar in the old Sanctuary of Monte Berico, which shows the city presenting gifts to its protectress, the Virgin.

But even here the sacred spirit is not marked, and the painting is reminiscent of that of the oval windows that formerly balanced those of Maffei in the Palazzo del Podestà and are now in the Museum — a work in honour of the Magistrates of Venice and of their followers, guided always by the Virtues. In the same gallery we can admire the artist in the less-accustomed rôle of portrait painter in the half-figure painting of a Musician — a woman garlanded with roses, and in the portrait of a Lady with a Muff. He is also the author of a lighter work — a pert little spirit blowing soap bubbles as it hovers above cabbages and fruit, an excellent contrast with the quiet peasant woman amongst the ruins, formerly in the collection of Dr. Aldo Briganti in Rome. And one must not forget the artist's portrait of himself as an old man which I saw in the Villa Carrer at Contarina (Polesine). *Plate 40*

In the Villa Pagello at Caldogno near Vicenza, where there is a room decorated by him with scenes from Guarino's *Pastor Fido,* we see him as a noteworthy painter of frescoes. But he is best known in galleries as the painter of those capricious works so much praised by Zanetti: «Bacchanals (in Vicenza, Venice etc.) dreams, sacrifices and other playful scenes» (Berlin, Ancona, Vienna, Budapest, etc.) where his fantasy has fuller range and is in advance of his time. He handles fantasy and rural simplicity with equal ease, and the serious and the playful are bound together by the landscape and the figures.

I need only mention, as typical, two of four works in Dresden which are, from our point of view, most instructive. These are two pictures inspired by stories from mythology: that of Coronis, who, when pursued by Neptune, was changed by Minerva into a crow, and that of Latona changing the peasants into frogs. In the former, there are two spirits with the triumphant air of those in the skies of Tiepolo, and the freshness of outlook and modern quality is seen in the beautiful, peaceful landscapes in which these strange metamorphoses are placed. *Plate 41*

Thus a sound tradition emerges from the ruin and the undergrowth, weary and a little hesitating, and soon there will come an artist who will be able to reveal it and to drink deeply from the cup it offers.

THE TRIAD of Renovators, besides having given us the works we have considered, had created a new and more living atmosphere in Venice and a readiness to appreciate all that was good in the new ideas.

There was still no one able to guide the newly recovered sense of colour towards decorative painting, but « primum vivere deinde philosophari », and without this revival in the use of colour, chief glory of Venetian art, and now the crying need of art throughout Europe, even these most unprejudiced and impetuous experiments could not have taken root.

The Venice that had been the home of Paolo Veronese had sold her birthright for less than a mess of pottage and now had to beg what, formerly, she had regally given away.

Berrettini da Cortona (1596-1669) had learned in Venice what decorative art demanded, as his altar-piece of Daniel in the Lions' Den formerly in San Daniele, now in the Accademia, bears witness; and there are few painted ceilings in Italy and Europe that do not owe something to him. It was not directly through him, however, that Venice regained her power, but in devious ways through Luca Giordano who was as much a master in large decorative painting as he was in the smaller works of the studio. Born in Naples in 1632, he came north before he was twenty, that is to say about 1650, at that critical moment when Venetian art, once more in possession of the means, sought freedom and inspiration in other fields towards which, Canal tells us, Forabosco had tried in vain to guide the first steps of Gregorio Lazzarini.

It may well be said that he, with Francesco Ruschi, breathed new life into all the younger generation.

We know very little of Francesco Ruschi or Rusca, a Roman, whom Zanetti places amongst the artists who introduced a more forceful style and who excelled in the painting of draperies. Apart from a few works, all that we know as certain about him we learn from the writings of Melchiori and of Temanza. Melchiori tells us that, like Pietro Liberi, he was the son of a Jew, a doctor, who had become a Christian, and Temanza, that he was a disciple of Cavalier d'Arpino, and had therefore reached his full development in art before 1640.

He flourished in Venice about the middle of the century and losing, happily, the objectionable mannerism of his first master, he came under the influence of the ampler decorative style of Cortona that is marked in all Ruschi's work. His painting of the ceiling of Sant'Anna, which has been destroyed, must have been modelled

upon Cortona. An equally grievous loss is that of the famous ceiling, no less typical of Cortona's influence, in the Libreria di San Giorgio, which was designed by Longhena between the years 1641 and 1671, and painted in collaboration by Giovanni Coli (1636-1681) and Filippo Gherardi (1643-1704), both of Lucca, who had done so much in Rome. Lanzi talks of the collaborators as *concordissimi di animo e di stile*, but the truth is that where Coli had no hand in the work, as in the frescoes of San Nicola da Tolentino and Palazzo Colonna, it lacks the admirable, abundant, vivid colour; a defect which is found in the unaided work of Filippo Gherardi, some examples of which I identified a few years ago in the stories of Alexander and Darius which belonged at one time to the heirs of Luzzatto in Venice and are now the property of the artist Italico Brass, a great admirer of seventeenth and eighteenth-century Venetian art.

To come back, however, to the work of Ruschi. A few of his altar-pieces are extant; in San Pietro in Castello, to the glory of St. Helena, at the Ospedaletto and at Santa Teresa. The influence of Caravaggio, which Zanetti professed to recognize, is not very apparent; but in his paintings in the Accademia at Venice and particularly in the picture of Christ and the Woman of Samaria, we see how much he must have been in contact with Coli and with Gherardi, and how much he was influenced by another native of Lucca, Pietro Testa, that later Poussin, who was so able a follower of Cortona. *Plate 42*

Temanza points out how, like Testa and even more, he was fond of using richly-folded drapery and how typical it is, not only of his work, but of that of his disciples: the Genoese Francesco Rosa, Antonio Zanchi who came from Este, the Venetian Pietro Negri and the Milanese Federico Cervelli. Dedalo (1922,V) gives examples of this characteristic, so much favoured in Venetian painting, in the altar-piece of Santa Teresa, dedicated to St. Ursula and in the less noted Repudiation of Hagar in the Pinacoteca at Treviso, reproduced in the present volume. The background has not the ruins, so much favoured by Ruschi, but the work is an excellent example of his subtle handling of abundant and flowing drapery. *Plate 43*

We shall discuss later the disciples and the many artists who derived from the Roman painter, but we must now return to Luca Giordano and to his appearance in Venice almost at the same time as Ruschi and the two painters from Lucca. The short time he spent there had the most surprising results precisely on account of this coincidence. He not only strengthened the tendencies of the moment, but went back with greater decision to the pseudo-tradition of Caravaggio, known to many as naturalistic, which had first appeared in Venice with Fetti and then been carried further by Liss, Strozzi, Renieri, and also by Pierfrancesco Mola, a Roman

(1612-1666). The latter was a neo-Venetian of the most decided kind and it was during his period in Venice that he did some of his most interesting work: the Turk at the Fountain and the Usurer, formerly in the collection of Gino Ravà, which I identified in the Florentine Exhibition of seventeenth and eighteenth-century art, (the Turk is reproduced in the volume of Ojetti-Dami-Tarchiani), Homer, in the Accademia, and the bust of an Apostle which is in the sacristy of the Sanctuary at Lendinara. These are all works in which the style of Veronese and Tintoretto is marvellously blended with that of Guercino and Elsheimer.

Luca Giordano was influenced by Caravaggio and also by Ribera through his work, directly, and also through his (Giordano's) father, who had been a modest pupil of that artist. Venice has any number of paintings in this *genre* in private and in public collections — dying St. Sebastians, philosophers and beggars — of which those in the Querini Stampalia collection are good enough examples. The young artists were struck by the ease and freedom of these paintings and by the effects that could be made apparently without much effort and they were all, like Giordano, a little of the «*fa presto* school».

He had a band of followers specially in work painted for collections or churches but they had no desire to do more than paint the customary altar-pieces. Among them were those most attached to the past.

But for originality and power in the use of colour, the palm must be given to Antonio Carneo, a native of Friuli, the leader of a band of fellow-countrymen. This group, with Bombelli in portrait-painting and Nicola Grassi in other branches, made something of a stir in the pre-eighteenth century and the eighteenth-century art of Friuli and Venetia. We are not certain, however, when Carneo was born nor when the school was formed. If the Last Supper dated 1604 is not his work, it is his father's, as many people have held on the authority of the signature. It was discovered by De Renaldis in San Francesco at Portogruaro and is now in the Duomo there, and the work looks as if the artist had been a disciple of some mannerist like Santo Peranda (*Della Pittura Friulana* 1798, p. 62).

The picture bears the name Giacomo, which is only that of an administrator of some religious order who commissioned the picture but was not the painter. Antonio's father was Giacomo Carniello, a modest bell-ringer or sacristan married to one Sabbada, and Antonio was born on the 26th of November 1637 at Concordia Sagittaria; the birth is recorded in the Register of Baptisms (at c. 186) and his death in the *Liber Mortuorum* (at c. 82). It is also recorded that he died on the 16th December 1692 in the neighbouring town of Portogruaro and that his body was taken to his native town and laid in the burying-ground of the old cathedral.

But Carneo lived most of his life in Friuli, the region to which he belonged, as his surname Carniello clearly shows. The name means «from Carnia» and was changed by the painter to Carneo. A few of his works and of his son Giacomo's, an artist of no great repute, who was still alive in 1752, can be seen in Udine. The son was an imitator of Fumiani, more than of his father, if, as seems certain, the picture of the Virgin and the Magistrates signed «Carneus» in the museum at the Castello, is his work.

Of Antonio's work there is, first of all, the Christ and the Tribute Money in San Giacomo, a painting that shows the influence of Luca Giordano — but of the Luca Giordano who was a follower of Ribera, who lays the paint on thickly and whose shadows are heavy but not opaque, admitting the influence of Caravaggio, but as it were at second hand: and, to the style of Giordano, Carneo has added the full technique of Strozzi. The influence of the Genoese is even more marked in the picture of Isaac blessing his son, in the Duomo, which is certainly by Antonio. It is an exact reproduction of a model of Orazio Deferrari. But his strong Venetian vein shows in works that are more original and living and which, it seems to me, combine all the tendencies of the good local painting of the seventeenth century. One need only have seen the collection of the Palazzo Caiselli that has, alas, been broken up and dispersed, fully to realize the possibilities of this art. *Plate 44*

There are the pictures of Autumn and Winter, represented by two hardy old men, in which the new technique is used with something of the inspiration of Tintoretto; the two variants of the painting of Vertumnus and Pomona — the two women are of widely differing age — in the manner of Padovanino, but in softer, gayer colour; an old Beggar, seated, and in contrast to him a Vagrant Woman, no less aged, which both show the direct influence of Fetti and prelude the work of Amorosi, as does a half-length picture of an Old Woman at the Brera identified by Suida. *Plate 45* *Plates 46a, b*

In the sketches, all in the accomplished manner of that of the Soldiers playing cards, one recognizes Maffei — the master of that light, clear-cut style, whose influence is clearly seen in the large picture in the museum at Udine, which represents the Virgin with the Venetian Governor kneeling at her feet to beg her protection for the city. These are all Antonio's and the weaker, signed work, as we have seen, is to be attributed to his son Giacomo. The picture is also noteworthy for the portraits, which prepare the way for the work of Bombelli, whom we shall see to be one of the fathers of eighteenth-century art, and indirectly for that of Francesco Pavona, a rival of Rosalba in pastel drawing. He was born at the time of Antonio's death, and therefore is a descendant of Carneo only by way of Giacomo, notwithstanding what De Renaldis says. *Plate 47*

From this school, so much influenced by Ruschi and Luca Giordano, came Giambattista Langetti (1625-1676), a Genoese taught by Cortona in Rome and by Cassana in Venice; a more emphatic artist than Carneo and a more decided follower of Ribera, a most gifted, if somewhat superficial, painter. We need only consider a few typical works: the Ecstasy of St. Jerome with the Angel, in the Brass collection where we see the first signs of the harmonious colouring of Giam-
Plate 48 battista Piazzetta, and the Apollo flaying Marsyas which is in Dresden and has the same glowing quality. There are many other works, scattered here and there in Italian and other collections, that were recognized as his after I had traced the outlines of his work a few years ago.

There are, for instance, pictures of Archimedes meditating and engaged in discussion in Brunswick, in the Palazzo Widman-Foscari in Venice and in the Pinacoteca Civica in Rimini (under the name of Jordaens); Mercury and Argus (Caviglia collection, Genoa); Joseph interpreting dreams (Boross collection, New York), the Seductions of Phryne (Külner collection, Augsburg): heavy shadows, prisons, nudes — a choice of subjects that shows a somewhat truculent, heavy temperament. Only in the Crucifixion in Santa Teresa, with the disconsolate Magdalene at the foot of the Cross, has he modified his style and given us something more genuine. The work is reminiscent of Van Dyck — a power, almost a divinity, to all painters of Genoa.

The picture with the complex subject is the chosen domain of these artists, and naturally the complexity grows more evident with the less skilful painter. Francesco Rosa's Miracle of St. Anthony in the Frari shows this very clearly. He was, according to Temanza, a native of Brescia, but Zanetti and Ratti speak of him as Genoese; the important point for us, however, is that he was evidently a disciple of Ruschi and used the purple colouring of this master, whom he perhaps knew at Rome, better than any other of his followers. Rosa was at his best in pictures of a single figure like those of the philosophers which bear his signature in the entrance hall of the Palazzo Sandi-Porto in the Corte dell'Albero at Venice.

We come now to Carlo Loth of Munich, the best representative of the tendency towards simple rather than decorative painting. Born in 1632, a son of that Ulrich who had been a follower of Saraceni in Venice, he spent his youth among the lagoons working in the school of Pietro Liberi, learning what little he could from that master whose influence is most obvious in the characteristic, large, full eye which appears in Loth's painting and in itself distinguishes him, in addition to the marked seventeenth-century character of his work. He has nothing of the rococo of his fol-
Plate 49 lower, Weissenkirker, in, for instance, his painting of the dying Jacob giving his

blessing to Joseph, which is in Vienna and was rightly held by Voss to be one of his most typical works in spite of Suida's attempt to deny it to Loth (*Belvedere,* 1924, 20).

Loth died, as one reads on his tomb in San Luca, on the 6th of June 1698, although strangely resuscitated in the books of the Fraglia degli Artisti which talk of him as being still alive in 1700. He could not have known those eighteenth-century tendencies that naturally affected his disciples and can be seen in the work of, for instance, Hans Weissenkirker and Michael Rottmayr (*H. Tietze, Jahrbuch d. Zentralkommission,* 1906, IV), and in Daniele Seiter. to whom many try to attribute works of their far superior master. His work has always a plastic force and he never paints in the thin and faded colour so much employed by his followers. It is this strength that has led to the confusion in the National Gallery in London where his finest work, the Mercury casting a spell upon Argus, has been attributed to no less an artist than Giovanni Liss, the father, however distant, of this type of art, as we have seen and shall see later. *Plate 50*

We shall only mention his more important pictures, guided by Voss, who was the first to trace them, scattered as they are throughout the galleries of Europe. Job among his friends which is in Dresden, the altar-piece in Munich with the Virgin and the Saints Dominic and Rosa; Jacob blessing his son, the Death of Agrippina, the Jove and Mercury with Baucis and Philemon, are in Vienna, the Death of St. Joseph in the Annunziata at Florence and finally, in Amsterdam, there is the Death of Orion.

The altar-pieces in Venice ought also to be mentioned, as these are the works for which we have the best documentary authority: the very dark one in San Giovanni Crisostomo, the Deposition in the Ospedaletto and in particular the most beautiful of them all, painted in competition with Antonio Zanchi who did the companion altar-piece, at Santa Maria del Giglio in the Barbaro chapel, the Glory of the Virgin and of St. Anthony, with the Martyrdom of St. Eugenius below.

We must definitely exclude from the above short list the Nativity in San Silvestro which even the best, most up-to-date guide books insist on quoting as a typical work, but which is in the manner of Procaccini tempered by Correggio, a style foreign to the work of Loth. The Nativity is a painting of Ludovico David da Lugano (1648 - Rome 1730) and is the only work of his in a public collection in Venice (another, bearing his signature, hangs in the Palazzo Albrizzi).

Another artist of this period is Pietro Negri, whom we have met as one of the disciples of Ruschi and who is known today by the large picture of the Saints of the Franciscan Order in the church of the Frari, painted in 1670, and by another, equally large but somewhat better, of the Virgin adored by St. Roch, St. Mark

and St. Sebastian. This is in the staircase of the school of San Rocco and was painted in 1673, as Migliori, his careful and well-informed biographer, tells us, to compete with Antonio Zanchi's Apparition of the Virgin to the plague-stricken people, of a few years earlier — 1666, to be precise (the sketch is in the Fischel collection in Vienna). This is the work that shows most clearly whither the new tendencies in decorative painting were leading those best able to profit by them — tendencies brought anew to Venice by Cortona and his followers.

We know from the work of Riccoboni that Zanchi was born in Este in 1631 and died of old age in Venice in 1722 — a length of years that gave him every opportunity of developing fully his gifts and of acquiring fame in Venetia and elsewhere. He was first recognized in Munich, the birthplace of Loth, his rival and, in matters of technique, almost his double, though Loth never had that grandiose quality in which Zanchi excelled all his Venetian contemporaries.

It is not impossible that the development of the somewhat younger German's style was influenced by that of the Venetian to which it is so much akin. Certainly the Bavarian capital has, on the high altar in the Theatiner-Kirche, a large painting by Zanchi to the glory of St. Adelaide, whereas Loth's altar-piece decorates a side altar. Melchiori tells us that there was in the Liechtenstein palace in Vienna a ceiling, thirty feet wide, painted by Zanchi, which is probably one of those restored by Bellucci.

Three of his ceilings are still to be seen in Venice: one above the staircase of the Seminario alla Salute; another, in sections, in the ceiling of Santa Maria Zobenigo or del Giglio, the favoured church of the artist, in which he was buried; and the third, at the Ateneo, depicting the Last Judgement (1674). They all show something of the manner of Luca Giordano.

No picture gives us so clear an understanding of the elements that go to make his art as the Marriage at Cana in the Duomo of Capodistria. Here we can see clearly, as we do in the work of Carneo, comparable in some aspects, the influences of Liberi and of Padovanino, that is of tradition, in the composition and in the choice of the types of women. The richness of the drapery of the turbaned oriental suggests Pietro Ruschi and the striking figure of a man at the left of the picture recalls Luca Giordano. Fortunately for art this is rarely the case. In his best work these influences meet and fuse to produce the strength and harmony of the large pictures where his decorative instinct had full play — a gift that contributed enormously to the renascence of Venetian painting.

There are beautiful altar-pieces and other works of his at Lendinara, especially in San Biagio, at Treviso in the church of San Niccolò, at Bergamo in Santa Maria

Maggiore, at Este, and in many other places: they all have richness and strength. It was only in his old age that his brush faltered a little and that he painted even in his large pictures in that weaker colour that one sees in some of the smaller easel-works. The Good Samaritan of the Goltara-Lussana collection in Bergamo, which appeared as a work of the Carracci in the Florentine Exhibition of seventeenth and eighteenth-century art, shows this failing; a weak reddish wine colour suffuses the whole and recalls the style of Langetti. *Plate 51*

We reproduce as one of his most representative works, that in the sacristy of Santa Maria Zobenigo, the church mentioned in connection with the work of Loth. It depicts Abraham in the act of dividing the kingdom of the world between himself and Lot; there is a group of wise men, clothed partly as prophets and partly as orientals, who seem to be united more in some magic compact than in a solemn and almost sacred convention. There are other half-naked figures standing amongst books and tables and astrolabes around a huge globe, while pages and attendants look on with eager attention. The work has strength in every feature, in the colour — orange yellows, blues, brilliant reds — and in the figures. The faces could not show more character, the figures look more concrete. Again we see the influence of Ribera and Giordano but this time it has all the vigour of Venice. *Plate 52*

There are more fanciful works like that in the former Benedictine convent of San Salvaro with which we shall end our survey of his work. It is a remarkable group, but this time of the Muses and of Actors, masks in hand, which glows with every virtue of the new movement but shows at the same time that the painter had wholly regained that mastery of pure form with no trace of superficiality, without which there was no possibility of a return to a great art really worthy of the past.

Venice had reawakened and was straining every nerve to enlarge the scope of her art: not that all her painters were more vital, but that now even the least of them, no longer tempted from the right path, worked towards her great future.

In the works of Pietro Bellotto da Volciano (1627-1700) Forabosco's gift in portraiture becomes a little barren and the gloomy colour that he had always avoided, as unbecoming to a Venetian, predominates. In the Young Girl, with a coloured handkerchief round her head, in Brunswick; the Old Woman, which has his signature, in Stuttgart; and the Portraits of the Artist in the Uffizi and the Brera at Milan, the lack of colour is even more striking and it looks as if he had tried to achieve a moonlight effect. But is not Pietro Bellotto perhaps the introducer of that subdued colouring used by Bernardo Bellotto, a secondary landscape painter in the style of Canaletto, his uncle, but a very different type of figure painter? And is he not, together with the other Bellotto — also nicknamed Canaletto — who recalls this *Plates 53a, b*

Pietro even in his name, an even more modest landscape painter, established in Nantes in 1765, a descendant of the Brescian, or at least his grandson?

From the fruitful school of Ruschi, and as a result of the Bolognese experiments, there came the ambiguous Gianantonio Fumiani (1643-1710), perhaps the most noted of his followers, but noted, as usual, for his work that least merits fame. He is famous not so much for his altar-pieces which are grandiose, but awkward and dull in colour like that in San Benedetto painted in 1668 and the large pictures in San Zaccaria, as for the enormous ceiling in San Pantaleone. He devoted twenty-five years, from 1680 to 1704, to this fresco to the glory of the patron saint, as if its accomplishment had been his sole aim in life. It certainly shows that Venice was again fully mistress of the most difficult effects of perspective. I find it difficult, however, to accept the doctrine that this considerable work is beautiful, and one ought not to believe this emphatic, frigid painting to have been the forerunner, as everyone asserts, of the triumphs of Tiepolo that followed closely upon it.

The folly of the assertion is obvious when we consider Tiepolo's work and see that in his painting he never adopted Fumiani's method — that is to say, the Roman method, where the artist may make use of all the artifices of architecture and exploit the figures. Tiepolo followed the Bolognese method, distinguishing clearly actual painting from framework and he adhered strictly to the distinction.

One must always talk guardedly of precursors. It has been held, and is still held by some, that Federico Cervelli was the master of Sebastiano Ricci. Cervelli was born in Milan in 1625, and did most of his work in Venice influenced more by Luca Giordano than by Ruschi whose pupil he was. We might still be willing to accept him as the forerunner of Ricci, in spite of the smallness of his works, of which there are a number in the Querini Stampalia collection, suggesting in their general effect the painting of the Veronese Biagio Falceri (cf. *J. v. Derschau, Ricci,* figg. 149-150), were it not for Temanza, who in his learned works speaks of the much better master Sebastiano Mazzoni. One cannot doubt Temanza, although Mazzoni may only have been Ricci's master at the beginning.

Neither can we say what Giuseppe Diamantini da Fossombrone, who had been in Venice since 1698, taught Rosalba Carriera and Santo Piatti whose master he is said to have been, when we see his dull altar-piece with the Adoration of the Magi in San Moisè. He is much more successful in the painting of a single figure like the David in Dresden, in the style of Simone Cantarini.

Paolo Pagani, a Lombard of Valsolda, was born about 1660 and died in 1716. In his art he was a true son of Venice and a follower especially of Pietro Liberi. There is more ground for thinking that Gianantonio Pellegrini derived from him

the rather trifling ease of manner that characterizes his work. It is difficult to understand how his nerveless painting could have been confused with the work of Liss in the Sacrifice of Abraham in Leningrad, which is much like that of Vincenzo Damini and sometimes that of Nicola Grassi (*Belvedere,* 1925, 40). In this way the eighteenth century found a new form of art based upon a certain uniformity which originated from these individual efforts.

It is not always advisable for the undiscriminating to draw from varied sources. Niccolò Bambini (1651-1735) belonged, with Andrea Celesti, to the school of Sebastiano Mazzoni, without being, for a time, like Mazzoni, influenced by the mannerism of Matteo Ponzone; he was also a friend of the young Ricci (born 1659). He, more than any other, dishonoured the teaching of his master by adopting the lifeless style of Maratta, of Rome, and doing even that badly. He has so little skill as a colourist and so little self-respect, that he had to have recourse to Niccolò Cassana who worked out his ideas, and he transmitted little more than this to Gaetano Zompini da Nervesa and Gerolamo Brusaferro.

But the true artist however much he may be misled, always learns and teaches something. Antonio Balestra, a native of Verona, did not, like Bambini, only bring from Rome affected airs and the rather watery painting that is his characteristic, but something also of the grace of Correggio and a consummate decorative skill (1666-1716). Through this gift he became a leader in Veronese painting where his teaching lived until the time of Anselmi and was an influence not only in Verona but also in Mantua, and, through the valley of the Adige, in Trentino which means a part of the baroque painting of Austria. In Venice he was the master of Giambattista Mariotti (1685-1756) whose work we know in San Vitale and San Stae; of Angelo Venturini who has a modest altar-piece at San Simeone Piccolo; and especially of Mattia Bortoloni, better known than the other two in Venice for his frescoes in the Tolentini, in Venetia for the two pictures in the parish church at Fratta Polesine, his native place, and still further afield for his frescoes at Mondovì. Bortoloni died, all too soon, in 1750.

Balestra opposed the risky methods of Maratta with all the solid qualities he had gained from Antonio Bellucci, a past-master in decorative art, who was born in 1654 at Pieve di Soligo. The latter painted with admirable ease, combining the traditions of Padovanino and of Liberi with the learning of Luca Giordano, but avoiding the sombre colouring of many of the followers of that master. It is his colour and his acceptance of tradition that make him superior to the others. *Plate 54*

He is the first of the wandering masters of the new Venetian painting, of whom later there were many. The books of the Fraglia tell us that he went to Germany

in 1705; he was in Vienna in 1709, working on the decoration of the Liechtenstein palace; from there he went on to Düsseldorf and then in 1716 to London. From London he returned to his native town, where he died in 1727. In his travels he met with much that was new and beneficial to the development of Venetian art. He saw the brilliant, lively French eighteenth-century painting and added something of that lighter quality to the traditions of Venice. But in Venice this was allied to a solid tradition that makes Venetian art greater than that of the French school.

The vehicle of this tenacious vitality of the seventeenth century, however, was naturally the school of Zanchi, in addition to Bellucci who is known in Venice only by his picture in San Pietro di Castello representing San Lorenzo Giustiniani imploring God to deliver the city from the plague, splendid in conception and in colour, and making a counterpart to Lazzarini's altar dedicated to St. Lawrence.

Plate 55 Antonio Molinari, a direct disciple of Zanchi, also handed on these traditions, and was joined in this school by the young Piazzetta, who with his love of deep shadows and vivid colours proved a better follower of the master from Este than Molinari, whose colour is almost always watery and his painting languid and insipid.

Giacomo Piazzetta, a modest sculptor in the manner of the equally modest Brustolon, has been in the past and is even today spoken of as the natural and only master of his brilliant son — to speak thus however, is a failure in discrimination between the lineage of the man and the descent of the artist.

The true rococo spirit came late to Venice, and this late arrival partly explains Francesco Trevisani's having to go to Rome in order to develop the little of this spirit which he possessed. He was a pupil of Zanchi himself and, according to Melchiori, a native of Castelfranco and not, as many have said, of Capodistria, quoting as their authority the *Biografia Universale* which has now been corrected by De Boni (*Biografia degli Artisti*, 1840). The rococo had already appeared, not only in Rome but also in Naples, in the later work of Luca Giordano and of Solimena but Sebastiano Ricci had certainly sought it in Italy before looking for it in Europe, and had not found it in Venice except in a few rare works that had come from abroad. He was a mature and established artist of wide experience when he introduced the rococo style to Venice.

Meanwhile the art of the seventeenth century held the field, slowly preparing the way for that of the eighteenth century. The development is most easily seen in the art of the portrait painters like Sebastiano Bombelli, and in that of Luca Carlevaris, who had such a large share in the development of the painting of views.

Sebastiano Bombelli of Udine was born in 1635 and was still alive, although infirm, on the 11th of January 1716 (*Bottari-Ticozzi, Letters,* V. 306). He was a

descendant of the group which adopted the good colouring of Strozzi and as we have seen reached its fullest development in Antonio Carneo. He dedicated himself to portraiture in preference to any other kind of painting and he brought to his work all the experience he had gained in Venice and in local fields. We can consider, as a starting point, the group which I discovered in the Museo del Seminario at Rovigo. According to Melchiori it was formerly in the Magistrato dell'Avogaria, near the clock, and has three living portraits of «Avogadori e puttini». It is cool and almost too soft in colour, closely resembling the work of that other Venetian descendant of Strozzi, Niccolò Cassana (1659-1714) who died, comparatively young and a drunkard, in England. He had been court painter to Queen Anne, and had had some influence on English art. In this connection it is interesting to compare the Portrait of a Warrior which was at one time attributed to Salvator Rosa with the portrait of the Artist in the Uffizi, which really foreshadows Rosalba and belongs to the master's Florentine period.

In Cassana we see the influence of Bombelli, in his early period, when he depended too much upon the teaching of the Bolognese school, and in a marked and rather unaccountable way, on Guercino. The artist's second period opens in 1663 when he began to travel and when he went, specially, to Vienna.

His relations with Johann Kupetzky (1666-1740) are not clear, but it is certain that he knew him and that by reason of his age alone he gave far more than he took. The same thing happened also in the case of Niccolò Cassana, and of Salomon Adler, who was half German and half Lombard and was called Salomon of Danzig, his native town, and only developed at the end of the seventeenth century. Bombelli undoubtedly paved the way for both these artists by the works he did for the Emperor, for the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and on his return to Venice.

Bombelli is the father of the showy Venetian portrait painting, as is proved by some works of his which I have identified in the Corridors of the Uffizi and by two typical paintings, one half and the other whole length, in the Querini Stampalia collection in Venice. In the two latter works the figures are well placed, richly clothed, pleasing and full of character; but the painting has been a little blackened by the use of a bad varnish which he had a mania for using for restoring and renewing his older works, a practice for which he was always blamed. It is praise enough of Bombelli to recall that the famous Vittore Ghislandi of Bergamo, called Fra Galgario, owes almost all his teaching to him. He belonged to Bombelli's school, and his work has the same splendour and fascination; but he exaggerated with astonishing daring that rather fatuous expression which is only just noticeable in his master's portraits. He added something to both Bombelli's virtues and his faults.

Plates 56, 57

Luca Carlevaris (1665-1731), another painter from Udine, had as much influence in his branch of art — the painting of «prospects» — although he was a dilettante rather than an artist *ex professo*.

Venice, during the seventeenth century, had completely forgotten the greatness of her earlier landscape painting to which she had been the first to lead the way and in which her school was the only one in Italy comparable to that of the studied, careful Flemish school. She began to lose her power at the end of the sixteenth century with the arrival of foreigners like Paolo Fiammingo and Pozzoserrato and, by the end of the decadent period that followed, her abdication was complete. Of the names that Boschini brings together at the end of his *Carta del Navegar Pitoresco,* where he talks of an imaginary picture gallery, hardly any are Italian. Moreover Monsù Cussin, Monsù Giron, Corrado Filgher, Michele Ston, are the merest names and we have hardly heard of the Sicilian Marolì who painted a few altar-pieces in his own part of the country. Who knows the sea-pieces of Giacomo Maffei? Who knows the paintings of Bartolomeo Pedon, a landscape artist and figure-painter (October 15th 1665 — February 3rd 1732), an incorrigible debauchee whomTemanza praises loudly in speaking of many paintings he did in Padua for the monastery of San Benedetto?

We can, it is true, talk of that wretched artist J. A. Eismann, who was born in 1604 and had come to Venice by 1644, where he remained until his death which the *Zibaldone* records as occurring in Santa Sofia in 1698. His work can be seen in Salzburg, Augsburg, Schleissheim, Dresden and Vienna. The paintings of his pupil Carlo Brisighella are only to be seen in Dresden. Finally, there is Antonio Marini, a Paduan who gave up painting because of his ill-health and all the work he can show is one picture in Feltre. But these were all lesser artists who had no following. They contributed little to art, hardly sufficient indeed to justify the assertion that this *genre* in Venice was not dead and buried.

Few would know of the works of Ilario Spolverini, a painter of battle scenes from Faenza, whose manner resembles that of Borgognone, although there is a whole series of his paintings in Venice, in the Museo dell'Arsenale, if the type had not been established, with better taste and more sense of colour, by his fellow-countryman and disciple Francesco Simonini of Parma (1689-1753) who taught the brothers Guardi and Francesco Casanova. In the same way no one would know of Angelo Everardi, called «il Fiammenghino» because of his Flemish birth, who brought his love of Bambocciate, like those of Bosch, to Brescia and to Venice, if his pupil Faustino Bocchi (1659-1742 c.), little younger than he, had not insisted upon their acceptance there. This type of work ended with Enrico Alberici of Bergamo

(1714-1775) who succeeded in ridding himself of the gloomy colour of his predecessors and painting in the clearer, more sparkling manner of the eighteenth century.

After this necessary preamble, we can return to Luca Carlevaris, who had the good sense not to seek inspiration from such poor local sources. He went, as a youth, to learn the art of landscape painting where it still flourished in the hands of Italian and foreign masters, in Rome.

We are not interested in his harbours, battles and rural scenes, which he did not paint so well as either his contemporaries or his predecessors and of which, though there were formerly others in the Palazzo Moro-Lin and the Palazzo Zenobio near the Carmini, the sole survivors are in the presbytery of San Pantaleone, sufficing to show us his thin and jarring colour, a bad imitation of that of Cerquozzi and of Borgognone. Hampered by this laboured style, Carlevaris would not have made a name for himself if he had not been led, in Rome, to consider the « prospect », which the picturesque scenery of Venice provides, as a subject of interest to the artist. He was guided in this by the forerunners of Gianantonio Pannini and by the painters of ruins, and specially by the careful Gaspare Vanvitelli, the Dutchman Van Vittel (1647-1736), who did so much work of this kind.

Thus, unconsciously, driven by a longing for that local colour that had been the glory of Venetian painting in the past, he returned to Gentile Bellini and to Carpaccio. He was so indifferent a craftsman that he had to use preparations to shade and harmonize his colour, but he was the pioneer of a style that, outside Italy and in the hands of foreigners and especially of the Flemish school, became a thing of glory.

His work is easily recognized by the roughness of the colour and the poverty of his figures, still of the seventeenth century in their total lack of atmosphere. There is a painting of his in Dresden — the entry of Count Colloredo, Imperial Ambassador at Venice, and two in Paris, signed and dated, of the Regatta and the Departure of the State Barge, belonging to Baron Michele Lazzaroni. The interest lies, not in the quality of the painting but in his gift for presenting charming scenes and characteristic aspects of the unique city. The hundred and three views of Venice, engraved in 1703, bear witness to his gifts and show convention led to truth. *Plate 58*

Thus Carlevaris, the modest artist of Friuli, had in his day an immense success as the discoverer of a new world, and he merits the gratitude and acknowledgment of posterity. If we cannot admire him as a genuine artist, we can boast of him, in his Venetian views, as the first romantic, the father, at least in his choice of subject, of that truly great painter of views Antonio Canal, called Canaletto. Carlevaris is said to have died of grief at the fame which was accorded, deservedly, to Canaletto. (*Moschini, Letteratura Veneziana,* III, 86).

We have seen, as we followed Venetian art throughout the seventeenth century, that it was not a fruitless period, as the indolent enquirer is only too ready to believe. It is a period that cannot be so lightly dismissed, for it is the bridge — however narrow and difficult — that spans the gulf between the old art and the new.

One cannot think of the eighteenth century only as the result of the preceding period: it must be considered both as a goal and as a starting point, and one can only look at the question fairly by having the courage, in the first place, to reject a number of the painters who are all that survive of the old legendary days, and nowadays can scarcely be taken seriously, although tradition, through force of habit and laziness, insists on repeating their names.

There is first Gregorio Lazzarini, a sincere but feeble follower of Gerolamo Forabosco, who Vincenzo Canal tells us in his life of Lazzarini (1732, printed by Moschini 1809) was Giambattista Tiepolo's first master. He had, however, scarcely any influence on Tiepolo's work.

His fame, perhaps on account of the harmless frivolity of his work, has survived even his neo-classic models, and has had the good fortune to come unquestioned through stormy periods that have turned much greater reputations into laughing-stocks. In this he is like Andrea Brustolon, a baroque sculptor from Belluno, who had certain gifts but rarely any good taste and who in any case is worthy of mention among the lesser artists, as much for his defects as for his good points. Their fame has no solid basis. Monsù Le Court, Josse de Cort, on the other hand, whose influence was widespread, has hardly been heard of, although his admirable group in S. Maria della Salute, painted at a time of plague, was taken as a model by Tiepolo almost a century later in his Madonna Gloriosa in the School of the Carmini.

The eccentric Francesco Planta, by whose better work Brustolon and Giacomo Piazzetta were influenced, Cabianca, Antonio Gai, Giammaria Morlaiter and the exquisite Antonio Bonazza are equally unknown. Giovanni Marchiori too must not be forgotten, whose work had scarcely been mentioned until recently at my suggestion he was reconsidered. It is, further, only fair to point out how Morlaiter corresponds to the pompous Cortona-like style of Sebastiano Ricci (Gesuati), and how Bonazza resembles Piazzetta and Longhi in his better work, by certain clever flights of invention such as those in the delightful figures of ladies, soldiers and peasants in the Widman Garden at Bagnoli, signed A. B.; while Marchiori, with his somewhat affected graces, looks forward to Pittoni. Brustolon we may leave aside in spite of

the partiality of the old historians, aided by Canova, who could not forget that he drew the inspiration for his Maddalena from the Belluno artist.

If amongst all these shadows we seek the real movers of eighteenth-century art, we shall see that in Venice the tendency is to be influenced by the preceding century. This we have partly seen already in, for example, portrait-painting, which based itself so largely upon Bernardo Strozzi, and in the painting of prospects, a fashion imposed and almost resuscitated by Luca Carlevaris.

But the triumph of the seventeenth century was deeper and more fundamental, for it had had the declared support of Giambattista Piazzetta (1682-1754), the first man of real genius whom the new movement can boast in Venice. Italian painting had degenerated into over-decoration on all sides, in Naples, Rome and in Bologna, and without him it would never have regained its position, nor escaped that superficiality which was its ruin not only in Italy, but also elsewhere.

The good qualities of Zanchi and Loth, that is to say a modified colouring in the manner of Caravaggio, were transmitted through Molinari, and this while it explains the solidity of the figures he painted, does not help us to understand the vitality that has come to them, eliminating the rigid geometrical lines and giving them living breathing qualities. This was an element foreign to Venetian art and must have come from outside — from Emilia whence came Correggio, that master of shadowy colour, the Praxiteles of painting. Pietro Faccini, and after him Guercino, did something to upset the academic rigour of the Carracci and to save the last and perhaps the greatest of the baroque painters of Bologna — Giuseppe Maria Crespi, the second and the better master of Piazzetta (1664-1747).

Crespi, who was of the emphatic school of Balestra, leads us, although the painting of the Fall of the Giants in the Palazzo Sagredo in Campo Santa Sofia shows how little suited the style was to his gifts, to another Venetian, Pietro Longhi (1702-1786). He attempted less ambitious work, scenes from the «Vie Galante», witticisms in paint whose attraction does not lie only in their exquisite colour.

Of a very different moral fibre from Longhi, and even from his admirable master, Piazzetta fully understood the importance of the painting of skin and flesh, and taught this to Giovan Marco Pitteri who translated it into engraving, perfecting the technique of Faldoni and taking up again the work Giulio Campagnola had done to interpret Giorgione.

In the Venetian artist's work there is no trace of those residues of the Carracci which had corrupted so much Italian art and spoiled that of Crespi. He very rarely deals with the small, gossiping scene that so much attracted Crespi and Longhi. He had a noble plastic gift that was of the Renaissance and that had the sense of reality

which Caravaggio and Rembrandt had exalted and which has earned renown for Edouard Manet in modern times. He learned this from Zanchi, Fetti, Strozzi, and above all from Liss, who do not contradict him but are his forerunners, especially the genial Liss who lived nearly a century before him.

Plate 60 Let us compare the Ecstasy of St. Jerome in the Tolentini by Liss with the Ecstasy of St. Francis in the museum at Vicenza. The attitude of the angel is almost the same in both pictures and it is the same attitude that the young Tiepolo, painting his first works under the guidance of Piazzetta, will reproduce in the Sacrifice of Isaac in the Ospedaletto. But the Rubens-like ardour in the work of Liss is toned down in Giambattista, and has become more intimate and more intense. The saint amongst the Rocks of Verna, bathed in the light of a fiery sunset, is a figure burning with the flame of the Divine — which leaves the German's light-hearted manner a thousand miles behind.

All the altar-pieces of Giambattista have the same powerful, moving quality. We have only to think of that in the Gesuati, with the Dominican friars in their white woollen cowls, or of the commanding Madonna in La Fava, of the Guardian Angel in San Vitale, tenderly protecting the little kicking child, or of the Beheading of John the Baptist, in Sant'Antonio at Padua, and the Assumption at Lille. There are also Biblical and rural scenes: the David in Dresden, the Fruitsellers (now in Sir Horace Rumbold's collection, Berlin), — a man and a woman with a red flower in her hair in the manner of Goya; she has put her work aside and looks for a flea, *Plate 59* displaying her beautiful young body; the Fortune-Teller in the Accademia (1740); the Ladies with sunshades, in Dublin. Finally there are the portraits, the beautiful *Plate 61* one in London and that of his pupil Giulia Lama in the collection of Dr. Planiscig in Vienna. They have all the same dignity of subject and of execution.

If we go from these smaller works to the more difficult problems of a ceiling, we shall find our artist no less at his ease and no less simple and impressive. In San Gio- *Plate 62* vanni e Paolo a little stretch of sky, without the stage-like effects of surrounding architectural features, is enough for him. The mode of Piazzetta was too severe to adapt itself to theatrical devices as used by the Carracci. He uses the merest indication of an arched frame, above which he places a daring group of big powerful monks. The whole group, in its foreshortening, its solidity and conception, is very different from the laughing Fates by his master Crespi, in the Palazzo Pepoli at Bologna. And, with a perfect realization of the value of spacing, the whole leads up to St. Dominic in glory. Thus Piazzetta stands, upon the threshold of the new century, proudly upholding all that was best in the seventeenth century, the real founder, as it were, of the eighteenth.

There follow the masters of the easy brilliant decorative style: first, Santo Piatti, who had little opportunity to add to his native gifts any foreign experience. All that remains today of his work in Venice are some half-spoilt frescoes along the staircase of the School of the Carmini; then comes Iacopo Amigoni (1675-1752) with his pale, flabby work. He travelled half over Europe, visiting London and Munich where his best frescoes are to be seen in the Schleissheim Castle, while Venice only knows him as the painter of the altar-pieces at San Stae, at La Fava and in S. Maria della Salute. On his return from London and Paris he spent a few years in Venice, between 1739 and 1747; but he was soon called to Madrid, as court painter, and there he remained.

Thirdly, one must recall Gianantonio Pellegrini, less affected in style than his compatriot and contemporary, with his clear, lightly-applied colour, and gifted with a fantasy inherited from his first master Pagani that places him between Liberi and Giordano. His best work was done abroad, and Holland, in the beautiful eighteenth-century Rijks-Museum, Belgium in the Brouwer Huis at Antwerp, Dresden and Paris, have well-known decoration of his. But Venice and Venetia also have certain works. There is, for instance, the beautiful painting in the sacristy of San Vitale, the parish in which he died on November 3rd, 1741. This picture of the Stoning of the Saint I found attributed to that wretched artist Elisabetta Lazzarini, the sister of Gregorio. A poor little altar-piece belonging to the artist's last period has also been preserved. (*Rivista Mensile di Venezia*, April 1927). There are two other altar-pieces in Padua, which disputes with Venice the honour of having been his birthplace in 1675. One is in the sacristy of the Eremitani and the other, a silvery grandiose work, is in the Duomo.

We must try and imagine how complete would have been the victory of this slick, attractive painting, empty and nerveless as it is, had not the more thoughtful work of Piazzetta proved both a safeguard and a corrective. The gifted and experienced Sebastiano Ricci would have been the first and the most gifted of this school which set out to astound rather than to conquer, if he had not found himself working with Giambattista Piazzetta, a moderating influence, on the one side and Magnasco, an incitement to further effort, on the other. These two artists were born later than Ricci but are essential to any understanding of his development. He had an extraordinary power of learning from every experience, so much so that even in his old age he was fully alive to the influence of an artist so much younger than himself — the genius Tiepolo, who had been to a great extent his disciple (1696-1770).

Ricci, was born on August 1st, 1659, a year earlier than the date still given by many. The date was settled by Father Francesco Pellegrini, who made so many va-

luable corrections regarding the Belluno artists such as Marco Ricci, Marchiori, Zais, etc., in a work published in 1892 on the occasion of the Monti Crocini wedding (Parma) and used, without acknowledgment, by von Derschau. Ricci's art, which originated from the experiments in colour made by Sebastiano Mazzoni, at once fell under the influence of the many varied works of Luca Giordano, even though it was only through the medium of Federico Cervelli — the Milanese artist who was supposed to be his only master, who took him to Lombardy where he must have met Magnasco.

This was the beginning of Ricci's long travels throughout Italy. His journeying brought him into contact with many different styles, but it kept him away too long from his own country and almost unaware of the progress of his native art.

Gifted with an extraordinary power of assimilation, he was able, on his flying visits and when he returned there to die, to keep Venice and Venetia in touch with all the new movements that had begun to stir in Italy itself and in other countries. The paintings at Parma (University) which were perhaps his first, show how much he was influenced in his composition by the school of Naples, an influence we have already seen in Pellegrini and one derived from the Cortona-like work of Luca Giordano. His drawing however is much more masterly, and Francesco Solimena, his more fortunate and precocious follower, shows the same ability. He was as clever as his master, in flooding half of Europe with his works.

In the Rape of Helen, and in the Mucius Scevola in the presence of Porsenna, he resembles Pellegrini so closely in some points as to be almost identical, and in the languishing Antioco his affinity with Bellucci is even more evident, and all his work shows how closely he had kept in contact with the Carracci and with Rome, where he had lost his heart to Baciccia. The sincerity of his enthusiasms allowed him to flit from one delicious model to another without losing his individuality as an artist. We can see the speed with which he developed by comparing the rather massive frescoes of San Bernardino dei Morti at Milan (about 1695) with the delicate work of those of the Palazzo Marucelli in Via San Gallo and in the Palazzo Pitti in Florence (about 1706). Indeed development is too slow a word — he seems to have leapt from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century.

Here for the first time we see something of the rococo of the early eighteenth century — due perhaps to the influence of his precursor Giovanni da San Giovanni. There are the light, clear-cut cornices, the play of light and shade on a golden ground, the airy skies in which the deities fade away in graduated, luminous circles. The ceiling of the room of the Labours of Hercules in the Palazzo Marucelli, and that with the Triumph of Diana and Actæon in the Palazzo Pitti already show

the linking and framing of subjects adopted later by Tiepolo in masterly fashion. But Venetia knew little of Ricci's experiments, which only became known there by hearsay, for, apart from the half-spoilt frescoes and pictures of the Palazzo Bertoldi (Belluno), there are only those in the Fulcis Chapel in San Pietro at Belluno and the remains of some painting in a chapel of the Carmini, not an outstanding piece of work even when it was complete, and the apse of the Cappella del Sacramento in Santa Giustina at Padua, which is theatrical and superficial. The apostles, arranged in a circle on the cornices, were inspired by Correggio — but a Correggio seen through the conventions and modifications of the Carracci. And yet it was painted only a year or two after the Ascension in Dresden (1702); but *Plate 63* the apostles in the latter picture are painted with a very different sincerity, and the Redeemer seems to leap towards Heaven with the movement of a ballet-dancer. In this work we see already the nervous quality of Magnasco and sense something of the intense humanity of Piazzetta. We shall see later on how important Magnasco's influence was for Ricci and for his nephew Marco, but at the moment we are only considering the principal stages of Ricci's achievements in Venice and Venetia, the most important on account of their effects upon the development of eighteenth-century art. We must not therefore forget the altar-piece, with St. Gregory in ecstasy before the Virgin, in the church of Santa Giustina at Padua. In this we see him moved by a desire to get back to the style of Paolo Veronese who thus came again, after the revivals of the seventeenth century, to be a power in the painting that was reborn amongst the lagoons.

To these works we can add the sections of the ceiling at San Marziale, dedicated to the Virgin and to the patron saint (1705), the framework of a ceiling in the Palazzo Robillant-Mocenigo on the Grand Canal, a few altar-pieces like that of the Guardian Angel, in the school of the same name and the Evangelists in the presbytery of San Sebastiano which at one time belonged to the frescoes in the cupola and are a vain attempt to replace the older work of Paolo Veronese, discoloured by time. The influence of Veronese becomes more and more marked in the ceiling of the presbytery of San Stae (1706), representing the Triumph of Faith, in the St. Peter freed from his chains in the same church, and in the impressive altar-piece of the year 1708, to the glory of the Virgin, in San Giorgio.

But of Ricci's work in his most gorgeous manner, as in the works in Florence, and as a precursor, there is still the ceiling of the Library of the Seminario alla Salute — the Glorification of Science — and this brings us to the year 1720, when he, returning with his nephew Marco from England and Holland, after an absence of almost ten years, knew life at its fullest and reached the height of his fame.

The Venice he found on his return was very different from the Venice he had left. It was alive and full of activity, but still without poise and with no sure foundation, and under the severe rule of Piazzetta. He had the good fortune however with his wide experience to guide, almost from his first steps, the young genius Giambattista Tiepolo who had worked for a short time and to very little purpose in the colourless school of Lazzarini. Piazzetta taught him, by the example he himself set, that the fashionable, daring work led to nothing but the emptiness of Amigoni and Pellegrini, unless to Ricci's startling acrobatics were added something more intimate, the mastery of movement, the solidity of the figures, and the hatred of all superficiality, however much it might be accepted and praised.

It was this struggle with form and with expression that made Tiepolo, as it were, the perfect Ricci — the real genius and the glory of eighteenth-century Venetian art.

His genius shows in his earliest works, cleverly placed in the arches of the walls in the Ospedaletto: two Prophets, powerful in their anger, and the Sacrifice of Isaac; *Plates 64, 65* in the similar picture in Dresden; in the Madonna del Carmine in the Brera; in the picture of St. Iacopo bound by an executioner in San Stae, which is almost his only work showing the influence of Piazzetta in the dark russet-brown colour and rugged powerful figures. With his next works the young Tiepolo comes to the period of his greatest painting that was to make him famous. There is the ceiling in the Pa- *Plate 66* lazzo Sandi-Porto in the Corte dell'Albero — mythological representations of Eloquence, with a frieze in chiaroscuro and a painting showing Achilles, disguised as a woman, discovered by the shrewd Ulysses: both paintings date from the construction of the building, the year 1725, and are quoted, with the others, by the older authorities. There is also a frieze, showing Moses saving his people from the plague of serpents, now in the Accademia; the frescoes in the archiepiscopal palace *Plate 67* at Udine; and the masterly works painted for the Palazzo Dolfin and now in Vienna and in Leningrad. These are all wholly different from the Venetian decoration of the past, and the change is certainly due to Piazzetta and to his teaching, upon which this new master based his art. He sees his composition as a whole from the outset, and his perspective leads the eye, step by step, towards the infinite. There is no nebulous diffusion of light, giving the work a conventional clarity — in fact he has gone back to the traditions of Paolo Veronese and his work has power and depth if not the softness of his master's colour.

We must now consider Ricci's last works: the Assumption in San Vitale, Pope Pius V and the saints in the Gesuati, the two altar-pieces in San Rocco, the painted designs for the mosaics in San Marco (1728-29). These all show how much he had

come under the fascination of the young genius who had really learned from him the value of clear colour, and how he tried to correct his facile *fa presto* manner.

Giambattista Pittoni (1687-1767) was making a similar effort just at this time, about the year 1725, in his most important painting of the Miracle of the Loaves and the Fishes, now in the Accademia, but painted for the church of Santi Cosma e Damiano at Giudecca, which was a treasure-house of the best eighteenth-century painting (three works of the Ricci which are now in Thiene, Somaglia and Venice, and pictures by Angelo Trevisani, Tiepolo, etc.) and this at once shows the significance of these attempts towards improvement. *Plate 68*

Up till this date Pittoni had been guided not so much by his uncle, Francesco, as is generally believed, but by Nicola Grassi a native of Friuli who was born close to the village to which his family had always belonged, at Formeaso della Carnia which is only a stone's throw from Imponzo. He was at first a follower of Carneo, as the few pictures in his native village show clearly, very similar to his Ecce Homo in the Trieste Museum. He had acquired in Venice a style that has, added to the softness of Piazzetta, something of what he had learned from the seventeenth-century innovations; so much so indeed that his outraged Job resembling a Christ crowned with thorns, which belongs to the antiquary Barozzi in Venice, was exhibited in Florence as a work by Liss. In his two big paintings in Dresden, the Death of Agrippina and the Death of Seneca, already catalogued in the year 1722, Pittoni shows as nothing more than a follower of Grassi, born five years before him in 1682, who in the Adoration of the Magi, in the Chiesa dell'Ospedale in Udine, and even more in the Finding of Moses in the Braidotti collection, might easily be confused with Pittoni himself, and whose affinity with Ricci is so great that his Baptism of Christ in the Barfüsserkirche at Augsburg — a typical work of Grassi's — was attributed by Voss to Sebastiano (*Das Schwäbische Museum,* 1923, 3). *Plate 69* *Plate 70*

But neither the later developments in Grassi's work — he died in 1748, and remained on the whole faithful to his early teaching — nor those subsequently followed by Pittoni, could be easily understood without the instance of Tiepolo, now the most significant figure in Venetian art. Pittoni's painting formerly in Santi Cosma e Damiano begins to show his influence, especially in the toning down of the colour and the lighter touch which suggests the early paintings of the master in the archbishop's palace at Udine, above all in the picture of Jacob and Rachel. *Plate 68* *Plate 67*

All the knowledge and experience of Venice appear to be gathered under the firm hand of the genius Tiepolo, who stamps it with the seal of his imagination and his power.

We are faced now, after tracing the rise of the splendid art of the eighteenth cen-

tury which placed Venice at the head of all schools of rococo, Italian and foreign, with the perplexing problem of the beginnings of landscape painting.

We have seen the appearance, in the work of Luca Carlevaris, of an important branch of this art — the «prospect» — and have seen too how soon all its possibilities were explored. Now we must talk of Landscape in the much wider sense in which it was understood in Venice, where it had none of the definite limits set by the «view» — landscape treated imaginatively, which had so many possibilities and was so closely linked to the «caprice», its last and most brilliant offshoot.

I have already pointed out how little the Venice of the seventeenth century understood what landscape had to offer and how, after the death of Giorgione and Titian, she remained a stranger to this *genre* in which, with her wonderful setting, she might so easily have excelled, after having given the impulse to the school of Bologna which transmitted it to Rome, Naples and Genoa, where it was treated in two different ways — the grander manner of the Carracci and of the French (Poussin and Claude Lorrain), and the romantic manner of Salvator Rosa. I say nothing of the Flemish and pseudo-Flemish schools whose landscape painting flourished alongside of the two Italian styles.

The art of landscape painting, therefore, must have come to Venice in one of these forms, and by good fortune it came in the more important — the picturesque manner of Salvator Rosa. It was through the gifted Marco Ricci, nephew and inseparable companion of Sebastiano Ricci, with whom he journeyed to England, that Venice first knew this kind of landscape. We will not stop to discuss Marco's strange and morbid disposition of which Temanza tells us and which led him, while still a young man, to take his life in 1729, five years before the death of Sebastiano.

We are only concerned with him as an artist and as the pupil of his uncle, to whom he was only fifteen years junior as he was born not in 1673 (the date always given before Pellegrini), but on the 5th of June 1676. He was a pupil alive to all that could be learned from every master whose teaching stirred his peculiar interest and touched upon his chosen subjects. He was both pupil and collaborator. The uncle and nephew worked together, Zanetti tells us, in paintings like that of Moses drawing water from the rock, now in the Accademia in Venice, in the Triumph of the Ark of the Covenant at Somaglia near Casalpusterlengo, in the Solomon speaking to the People, in Thiene — pictures originally in the church of Santi Cosma e Damiano — where the landscape and background are of special importance. Their work is an example of that remarkable collaboration in figures and in perspective which characterizes not only Venetian but all eighteenth-century painting, and did not always have the happiest results. Here, however, it was no casual partnership

but a union, long sustained, between two artists in the closest sympathy, as that further typical example of their joint work, the view with ruins and figures in the museum at Vicenza and also that in the Contini Collection at Rome, amply proves.

Marco Ricci's work, therefore, has its origins in that of his uncle, Sebastiano, through whom he goes back to Mazzoni, and after him came Salvator Rosa, especially as regards invention; while as far as colour and a certain ampler and broader movement are concerned, we must not forget the influence of the Flemish painter, Tempesta (Pieter Muliers 1637-1701), whose work was held in great esteem in Venetian circles. Marco's paintings show that he drew his inspiration from this generous source rather than from the more limited Neapolitan master. He preferred his valley of the Piave at the point near Mel and Belluno where it opens picturesquely, to ravines and gorges, and it is in this unvaried preference that he approaches the greatest of his forerunners in this field of art, Vecellio. Influenced by him, and, less directly, by Domenico Campagnola and by Boldrini, Marco sought his inspiration in the landscape of the foothills of the Alps whose characteristic features appear in all his drawings formerly in the Cernazai collection at Udine and later in the Dal Zotto collection in Venice. The work of artists akin to him, like Bernardo Zilotti of Bassano, has the same character in both engravings and drawings.

Plate 71

These characteristics became so much a part of Ricci's work that he has even been confused with Titian himself, by well-intentioned critics, in a drawing in the National Gallery, Edinburgh (*Vasari Society*, IX, 8), and we see the same characteristics appearing in the prints of Giampiccoli, his nephew and in the work of other artists. Fully to appreciate this *genre*, its possibilities and limitations, we should look at works like the Waterfall in the Accademia in Venice, the freest example of the period, the mountain landscape with horses drinking by a stream, and an approaching thunderstorm; and lastly a group of eight similar views in Dresden which Rossi acquired for this gallery in 1738. And we must mention those that were in the Dal Zotto collection in Venice where some are still to be found; the painting is smooth and flat in colour and might easily be mistaken for the work of foreign artists or even, as often happens, for that of Rosa himself: for example in a typical picture at the Hague which has been attributed, it is difficult to say on what grounds, to the Spanish school. These works show a very sparing use of figures and their treatment is somewhat laboured.

All students of Marco Ricci have stopped at this stage of his artistic development, and so have only taken account of that older side of his work which, when we look at it as a whole, we see only as a prelude that promises much in all that was to follow;

and the customary neglect of his later development makes a recent study of this delightful branch of eighteenth-century art (*I. Haumann, Das oberitalienische Landschaftsbild des Settecento,* Strasburg, Heitz, 1927) disappointing and profitless.

It was through the work of his uncle Sebastiano that Marco, his constant companion, must have known the influence of Alessandro Magnasco whose connection with the older Ricci was by no means one-sided, since, while the one taught through his restless imagination, the other gave with his masterly technique. But Marco only benefited from this influence which he accepted all the more readily on account of the common inspiration, more brilliant in its effects as far as Magnasco was concerned, which they drew from Salvator Rosa. For whereas the older Sebastian was an enthusiast in his reception of the ideas of the Genoese artist, Marco was wholly converted, and thus the one helped the other.

It is useless to talk of Ricci, the uncle, having been about ten years older than Lissandrino when the evidence of contemporaries, Ratti (*Vite,* II, 159) and Pasta (*Pitture di Bergamo,* 106), shows the ardent admiration he had for Magnasco who brought his glowing colour to the diableries of Callot in painting which is now the joy of connoisseurs and was the forerunner of half of Goya's work and of more than half of Daumier's. And even if we had no other evidence, Ricci himself in the drawings now the property of the Venetian Accademia, formerly, like those of Marco mentioned above, in the Cernazai-Dal Zotto collection, shows how great his debt to Magnasco was. Here he has left work, like the typical group of monks
Plate 72a gathered in a grotto to do penance, which is really copied from the master who inspired him. This drawing corresponds almost exactly to a small painting by the same
Plate 72b Ricci that I found in the Brass collection in Venice. And must we not attri-
Plate 73 bute to Ricci the Temptation of St. Anthony in the Munich Gallery, a variant of a picture by Magnasco which was recognized by von Derschau, and copied again by Gaspare Diziani, Ricci's disciple, in a painting in the museum at Padua? Do not the four paintings in the Accademia in Venice, at one time attributed to Ricci and now given to the young Tiepolo, show the influence of Magnasco and prove clearly the artist's descent from the master of Belluno? And does not Francesco Guardi derive broadly from Magnasco in his sea-pieces, his landscapes and largely
Plate 74 in his figures, while in his Capriccio formerly in the Haberstock Gallery in Berlin he is clearly copying the Storyteller of his master? (*Geiger, Magnasco,* plate XXV).

In Marco this passion for reconstruction is seen in his return to stormy sea-pieces and his large pictures are a blend of Pieter Muliers and of Magnasco, with animated groups sketched in a few skilful lines and harmonizing completely with the background. His seascapes at Bassano used to be in the Dal Zotto collection where

most of them were attributed to Rosa (photo Naya 1453-1455). Geiger — and this shows how carefully we must sift our sources of information — insists that the two works, even more typical of Marco, in the Pinacoteca at Bologna, belong undoubtedly to Magnasco, whereas the foaming rushing water has obviously the placid background, so frequent with Marco, of the valley of the Piave in its most picturesque aspects round Feltre and on the slopes of Mount Pizzocco. They are almost masterpieces and from them to the Tempests of Guardi (*Geiger,* II) the step is a short one. The resemblance to the work of Magnasco, if it is not closer is more striking, when it appears in the work done in collaboration by the uncle and the nephew for which we have the evidence of Zanetti, in paintings like those in Santi Cosma e Damiano and particularly in the picture of Moses drawing water from the rock. These are the works most commonly confused with those of Magnasco; from the little picture in Munich to actual copies made by the Ricci (*Geiger,* IV-XII), who were both imitators and plagiarists when it suited their convenience. Let me mention two examples of this interesting period. The first was shown in 1928 in the National Gallery in Edinburgh and again represented the valley near Belluno, with white-robed monks in prayer and meditation on the banks of the stream. This work can leave no doubt as to its authorship in the minds of those familiar with the style of the Ricci and their little tricks, and to make a study of Magnasco with this in mind would lead to the clearing up of many difficulties, for our knowledge has up to the present been far from accurate: confused, as all such knowledge must be, when it takes no account either of what has gone before or of the results that follow.

Plate 75

Plate 76

The second picture is a mountain scene in the Rivoltella Museum at Trieste and it leads us to even more remarkable conclusions. There is no question here of plagiarism as there is in the copies and variations, but of a Venetian interpretation of Magnasco's fancy, which was all the easier for Sebastiano Ricci, as the subtle technique of Magnasco, far removed from the decorative style of Valerio Castello who influenced him in his early period, must have been derived from Sebastiano himself. These experiments are of special importance in the landscape painting so much favoured by the eighteenth century, with its many groups of living figures which are not used purely as decoration, but with intention, and are treated as if the work were figure-painting on a small scale. Pilgrims and monks, shepherds and peasants, are walking on the slopes and by the river in the painting in Trieste and in the foreground there are some washerwomen rinsing clothes and washing dishes, sisters to those women drinking so eagerly in the picture of Moses.

Plate 77b

Plate 77a

Plate 78b

Plate 78a

And so from the pastoral landscape, peaceful and a little too well-ordered, we come to a new style of landscape, to the picture of ruins, to the storms and to the caprice,

which makes up a good half of the new Venetian work and is one of the chief sources of European painting. Marco and Sebastiano Ricci were as much the founders of the new school as Piazzetta and Tiepolo were of that of monumental painting.

We must, however, do justice to Giuseppe Zais if we are to understand the development in landscape painting. He also was a native of Belluno and has not only been neglected, like the two Ricci, but has been placed amongst the artists of the latter part of the century when he is really one of the earliest. The date of his birth has always been believed to be 1750 or thereabouts; but the invaluable little work of Pellegrini tells us he was born at Canale d'Agordo, the son of Giacomo and Maria, on the 22nd of March 1709 — forty years earlier!

The correction of these two mistakes, the place of his birth (which was not Treviso where he died, an old man, in 1784) and the year, makes quite clear what his painting itself told us, but in vain: namely, that he was the direct, and perhaps the only, disciple of Marco Ricci, coming from the same part of the country and having like his master a love of the mountainous country-side near Belluno. His broad background with its exquisite silvery colouring is a forerunner of the work of Guardi, *Plate 79* and is peopled by the charming Arcadian shepherds that Francesco Zuccarelli, a Tuscan, had brought into vogue in Venice. And Zais shows here the same independence as in those works both large and small, inspired by prints, that brought him an echo of the work of Watteau and other French painters.

While the art of landscape painting was thus born in Venice, the art of the «view» reached one of its highest points in the work of Gianantonio Canal, nicknamed Canaletto. Mariette, who had his information directly from the artist, tells us in his *Abecedario* that Canal was born on October 18th 1697.

He gave up only in 1719 the theatrical painting to which he had been brought up by his father, and set himself a definite programme which might have come from a much maturer mind. This clear-cut scheme is at once the strength and the weakness of his art.

He was convinced of the soundness of his plans by seeing how remunerative the cold work of Luca Carlevaris had become, and was helped by Giampaolo Pannini whose work, though almost as cold, was a good deal more skilful and whom he had known in Rome as the chief representative of the manner of the Bibbiena in perspective and in painting of Roberti, Ghisolfi and Locatelli. This painting, which except for the groups of figures attached more importance to quadrature than to a freer type of art, was even more systematized by Canaletto by his use of the camera obscura although Mariette says he corrected any errors!

He had luckily a keen sense of colour and an appreciation of atmosphere and of

the picturesque even in his earliest works: those painted, for instance, in 1725-26 for Stefano Conti of Lucca which are now in England (*Burlington Magazine* 1923, 47, p. 278) and those for the Duke of Richmond in 1728. Such were the gifts that led him to set out on his triumphant conquest of the picturesque. All his larger pictures in the Liechtenstein Gallery with views of the Grand Canal and the more interest- *Plate 80*
ing ones in the National Gallery in London — the Festa di San Rocco, showing the exhibition of paintings outside the school and the procession of the Doge, and the romantic Scuola della Carità seen from the other side of the Grand Canal — belong *Plate 81*
to this glorious period. In these the scene is represented in every detail, but the works have wealth of colour, contrasting light and shade, the most varied skies, and where he has allowed himself to introduce figures they have a fine, human touch. The porcelain-like quality did not appear in his work before 1743, the date on the big view of Rome with the Colosseum, at Hampton Court.

But after his travels in England, or rather after his first journey in 1746 which was followed by a second in 1751 — we can be certain of the dates now, thanks to the work of Hilda Findberg (*Walpole Society*, IX-X), Canaletto's work became stereotyped. He grew increasingly precise in line, his painting became more china-like and his figures lost their living quality and came to be the merest signs, like bundles of coloured wool. He had established a style for his figures in his early paintings, but in these they were alive as they are in certain drawings in the possession of Sir Robert Witt, in London.

How and when can this change have come about? A change that is even to our impartial eyes an obvious and lamentable retrogression.

The reasons are difficult to find. We can only say that the production of so calculating an artist as Canal was not dictated by mere fancy — certain studies of Darmstadt make this clear — and that when he found his work in favour with his English admirers he made the most of the opportunity and altered and modified to suit the taste of his English clientele, the most important ever since his Venice days when the Consul, Smith, purchased many of his works.

The clear colour of the Dutch artists, which he derived from Vermeer's mechanical imitators and not from the master himself, turned his head; and it was Jan van der Heyden, a Dutchman much in favour in London, where he had done *Plate 82a*
a good deal of work, who chiefly influenced him. This school had reduced art to something of a formula, and Canal was open to such teaching. He tried from now on to model himself upon van der Heyden, using wherever he could odd smears of colour in the outline of his subjects. It was to this that conventional usage had reduced the divine Vermeer's gay and inimitable colour.

The comparison of one of Canal's smaller pictures in the National Gallery in London (No. 992) — a landscape with houses in the background — with another work of his English period will bring home to us the melancholy truth. The Fantasia that Canal himself presented to the Venetian Academy of Painting shows that he had been unable to rid himself of this methodical, crystallized manner. The work was signed and dated 1765 and belongs to the period shortly before his death on April 20th 1768.

Plate 82 b

The increasing rigidity of Canaletto's style did not lead him to consider his figures as apart from the whole; he reduced them to a formula but he never allowed them to be painted by any other hand, and Moschini's testimony to the contrary carries no weight as he was wont to listen to any tale (*Letteratura Veneziana*, III, 77). It was a common practice amongst landscape artists and painters of views in the later period, and specially in Venice where, for instance, Francesco Battaglioli worked with Zugno, a follower of Tiepolo. This is the Battaglioli who, we are told, was born in 1746. I can, however, prove that ten years later he was a painter, for there are two pictures, views of Aranjuez, fully signed, and executed for Farinelli as the writing on the back of the canvases shows. Algarotti assures us that even the great Tiepolo drew the figures in the architectural drawings of Gaspare Pesci of Bologna and of Maurino, that is, of Antonio Mauri.

This harmony between figures and landscape painted by the same artist is the glory of Claude Monet in modern art, and was to make the fame of Francesco Guardi in the eighteenth century. Only the habit of studying art by *genre* could have led to Guardi's being regarded as a disciple of Canal: in origin, development, method and achievement, the one is the antithesis of the other.

Critics were more than unwilling to accept this opinion from me, although today no one can deny its truth and it has now irrefutable proof. There is, to begin with, the organ front in San Raffaele, one of the masterpieces of the eighteenth century, painted about 1750, a little later than the large figures of Hope and Charity on the sides, with, at the back, a sea-piece signed: *F. Guardi F. l'anno 1747* (*Burlington Magazine*, May 1927).

Plate 83

He was a pupil of his brother Gianantonio, a follower of Ricci, and inherited from him, who in his turn had been taught by the father, his soft subtle colour and much that was characteristic of the baroque painting of Trentino and of Austria. He was born in Venice in 1712 and died in 1773.

In his painting of views he had none of Canaletto's documentary manner and nothing could be further removed from the camera obscura method than Guardi's sensitive, romantic approach which is almost that of the modern artist. Festivals

— like the beautiful one in the Alte Pinakothek in Munich, here reproduced, representing a Ladies' Concert in honour of the Counts of the North given in the Sala dei Filarmonici at Venice in 1782 — caprices, views, were all so many fragments of a fleeting reality that could not be disciplined by science nor measured by any compass. Reality, seen not by the ordinary eye, but as it were by the eyes of the heart, and recorded with a brush that was tremblingly alive. For Guardi the slightest suggestion of a subject was enough — an engraving, a painting, a word almost — and the whole came to life again in the imagination of the artist.

Plate 84

Plate 85

CONCLUSION

In our survey of the seventeenth century — a living century in spite of the many perplexities and mistakes of that disturbed time between the death of an old world and the birth of a new — we have sought to link the new Venetian painting to its great traditions.

The fluttering flame had been kept alive amongst the ruins of mannerism by the devotion of Padovanino and at first the only break that stirred it came from abroad, from the international painting that arose after the great reforms of Michelangelo da Caravaggio.

Thus revived, Venetian painting, fearful at first, grew more assured and more daring and found itself once again in the van of creative art. All that seemed lost at the beginning of the seventeenth century seemed at the beginning of the eighteenth to have been regained.

First in smaller easel-pieces and then in important works, the Venetians recovered the joy of painting, the love of good colour. In Venice perspective never completely dominated invention, because even in her most decadent period Venice, unlike Bologna, had always been averse to reducing perspective to mere academical rules, and had refrained from that excessive decoration which at Rome, Naples and in Emilia appeared to place the technical aspect on an equal footing with the more liberal interpretation of art. Venice had respected what good art demands even from genius — painstaking industry, vitality, zeal.

The man must be the servant of his art, with a feeling for atmosphere, a sense of line and a faultless knowledge of foreshortening to be able, like Tiepolo, to fill his wide skies with gods and saints. Tiepolo planned every inch of the many ceilings and canvases that Italy and Europe owe to his genius, as perhaps no other artist had done.

For work like Guardi's, on the other hand, that dealt in the small canvas with the human, ever-changing life of Venice, her art had to regain that knowledge of colour for which she had once been famous, and her labours were crowned by the achievement of colouring more exquisite than anything yet attempted.

The tracing of many complicated genealogies, the setting in order of family records has been necessary before one could come to profitable conclusions. It is only in this way that one can see genius in its proper setting and without distortion: an aim that justifies digressions that appear to have neither rhyme nor reason.

One cannot therefore talk of any real appreciation of the seventeenth century until one has traced everything to which the period gave birth, nor of the eighteenth

until one has linked it at every point with the past, and seen the influence of one artist upon another, the conflict and the acceptance of ideas — everything that made a world of this stormy age.

The tendency, alas, has been to snatch at the most showy flowers of the laughing garden, and the garden itself has been neglected. How could the harvest be a happy one?

We have been told, for instance, of Giambattista Piazzetta, as we have seen, that he, the founder of a great school was the son of nobody, or, at the most, that the father was a sculptor of no importance who had nothing to give his son. No word is said of Zanchi and of his school which ended worthily with Piazzetta. And what is one to say of the works? A good half of those ascribed to him in the only monograph on the subject, and in a few other studies, are the works of his many followers and even of members of his family like the little-known Felice Cignaroli, a friar of Verona. There is a vast difference between Piazzetta and his followers. Even when they were not unworthy of him they were as far removed from the master as the merely obvious is from the really great. Francesco Daggiù, called Cappella, refined in style and mindful of Tiepolo, Antonio Marinetti, called Chioggiotto, so close an imitator of the master as to be wearisome, Giulia Lama, exaggerated in her effeminate rendering of flesh tints, Giuseppe Angeli with his feeble colouring and laboured work, Francesco Polazzo and Domenico Maggiotto, the most unscrupulous of plagiarists: any of these painters is ignorantly and wilfully confused with Giambattista, and his work and fame lie buried under the weight of these parasites. Learning has dedicated volume after volume to Tiepolo, to his work as a whole, to his engravings, to his drawings, but despite all this work we still know very little of him as a youth and our knowledge is further complicated by the four paintings we mentioned in the Accademia having been attributed to him rather than to Francesco Fontebasso, a follower of Ricci, who collaborated with Tiepolo at Udine, as we can see by an engraving of his which has been placed as an original amongst the few left by the master (*Molmenti*, 51). How can we discuss the great painting of his brilliant period while we still cannot distinguish between the pupil and the collaborator? There is no one today who would fail to attribute to Ricci the Christ praying in the Garden of Gethsemane in the Liechtenstein Gallery and the Toilet of Venus in Berlin, or to Giambattista Pittoni the picture of Rebecca at the Well in Bordeaux, or to see that the St. Bruno in the Viennese Academy is the work of a Spanish artist: but how many can distinguish the work of Giulio Cesare Ligari of Valtellina, the painter of the Plague of Serpents in the Ambrosiana, and Giustino Menescardi of Milan to whom we owe the Prophets and the

Evangelists round the Assumption by Padovanino in the School of the Carmini, or the sketch in the Chiaramonte Bordonaro collection at Palermo, from the work of Tiepolo's early days? And how many there were, and still are, who insist on giving to the mature period of the master works of his son, Giandomenico — a mistake that was made with the decoration above the doors in Würzburg (1751). The two Papadopoli paintings and the two pictures of episodes in the life of Abraham, in the possession of Senator Albertini, belong undoubtedly to that later period, resembling the engravings for the Flight into Egypt (*Dedalo,* V, pp. 334-335) and those used for the chiaroscuri of the Pietà at Udine, a work of the year 1759 and not of 1734. There are other interesting followers belonging to this period, like Lorenzino of Verona and the subtle Francesco Zugno, whose work also needs to be carefully distinguished.

Think of it! Only three of the seven pictures attributed to Giambattista Tiepolo in the National Gallery in London in 1928 are by him: a small Crucifixion and two sketches, one of San Massimo and the other of Sant'Osvaldo. The other four were the work of Giandomenico and not the two that are given as his: one of these, the Finding of Moses, is very typical of Zugno. And what is one to think of the sketches of Tiepolo which one sees so often repeated? Are they not, as a rule, works of his school as in the case of the Finding of Moses at Stuttgart and the Martyrdom of St. Agatha in the Museo Correr, however much it may resemble the drawing formerly in the Orloff collection, or actual forgeries like the little Sartorio picture of the Trieste Museum which claimed to be a sketch for the Artaria Birth of Venus, a magnificent work recently acquired by the Dresden Gallery (*Zeitschr. f. B. K.* 61, 12)?

When we have to question so many statements in serious works on Piazzetta and Tiepolo, I hardly venture to talk of other important artists of the eighteenth century: of Canaletto and the refinement of his strangely retrograde work; of Giambattista Pittoni and his connection with Grassi, the master and friend of whom so little is known; of Giambattista Crosato, the decorator of Stupinigi, confused with De Mura through some sketches made for tapestry in the Palazzo Reale in Venice (*Dedalo*, July 1926, *Rivista Mensile di Venezia*, April 1927); of Bazzani, a Mantuan who did exquisite work and has been mistaken for a plastic artist of no importance of Reggio Emilia. I do not speak of artists like Vincenzo Damini who came under the influence of Solimena and is known like some secret only to research workers. He was exiled to Aquila in Abruzzi and I found his surname on a beautiful Baccanale at Cassel.

There are painters, however, about whom almost too much is known, for reasons which often have little to do with art; Rosalba Carriera, for example, a pastel artist who could not go beyond herself, while one hardly hears of Francesco Pavona, her

not unworthy rival, and nothing of pupils like Felicita and Angioletta Sartori, and of Marianna Carlevaris, Luca's daughter, who painted two good portraits, signed and dated 1750, which I have seen in a collection at Padua. She is only mentioned, as far as I know, by Temanza.

Most of the work of Pietro Longhi, who showed an exquisite technique but very little intelligence, is known, but no one has noticed among his trifles the work of his son Alessandro who has the bitter laughter that is perhaps overpraised in William Hogarth who, in his turn, knew something of the influence of Bombelli. We have only to compare the Exhibition of the Rhinoceros of 1751, which is in the Museo Correr and in a delightful original replica in London, with the edition by the son in the Salom collection in Venice, to see how they differ in colour and vivacity and lead on to the even more vigorous Charlatan of the Städel Institute in Frankfort. They all, of course, go under the name of Pietro and the fame of Alessandro, the last of the great Venetians (1733-1813) still suffers. He was most successful in portrait-painting, and the frescoes of the Palazzo Grassi-Stucky are like the work of some modern artist. The fresco, painted all up the staircase, is of some festivity, and is amazing in its truth and its simplicity. The name of the wretched Michelangelo Morlaiter is given to a work like this on the authority of a sentence in Moschini that can be read to mean anything!

Plate 86

Plate 87 a

Plate 87 b

Plate 88

The teaching of Alessandro spread rapidly through Europe by way of the painting of Giuseppe Flipart, a disciple both of Pietro and of Alessandro and court painter in Madrid a little after Tiepolo and before Goya. He was perhaps preceded also by Gaspare Traversi, whose work, as I was the first to point out, should be distinguished from that of the poor artist Bonito with which it has been confused (*Rivista Mensile di Venezia*, April 1927). He was a Neapolitan only by birth, as his art developed in Venice and in France where he must have done most of his work.

Venice was then at the height of her power, and attracted all the most promising artists, who came to Venice to learn. There, naturally, they gathered round the young Longhi, and Guardi, and the more living artists of the time. Who can fail to see their influence in Richard Wilson, whose beautiful portrait of a gentleman, dated 1751 and now in London, I saw some years ago in Venice; or in Nathaniel Dance in the Sertorio Family (Modena, Museo Civico), or in the portrait in Florence of the violinist Pietro Nardini, painted in 1759? Who would deny Longhi's influence in the rather expressionless busts of the Austrian Brandt?

Eighteenth-century Venice was a living centre astir with an interest in the theatre, in music and in plastic art. The Republic, as its power declined, turned a deaf ear to the threatening rumble of the approaching ruin that was to sweep away both

liberty and art. The proud tree was to be shattered and the frenzied people were to dance around the remains of greatness as the mob had done during the French Revolution.

Only the provinces, with a touching loyalty, kept something of the glorious past, and we shall find artists in Verona, from the versatile and fanciful Marco Marcola, who has been confused with Longhi and even with Francesco Guardi — an honour not undeserved by the gay trio of Harlequin, Columbine and Pantaloon in the work belonging to Mr. Worms in Paris — to the delicate Ugolini and the ornate Saverio Della Rosa, an heir of the Cignaroli family who deserved so well of art. But the most surprising survival will be found in Bernardino Bisson of Palmanova (1762 - Milan 1844) who through Francesco Chiaruttini (1748-1796), a pupil of Tiepolo who paints theatrical figures like those of Pannini and Piranesi, is the last representative of the eighteenth century. He was a follower of Chiaruttini in his frescoes and theatre painting, and so to some extent a descendant of Tiepolo, whose gay inventions of the Villa of Zianigo he adopted in his signed frescoes in the Palazzo Manzoni at Padua, in which are ceilings with allegoric subjects, half-Pompeian arabesques, and on the staircase a garden bright with festive groups. He made brilliant attempts at every style of painting — the caprice in the manner of Guardi and Magnasco, the prospect and the festa in the manner of Canaletto, landscapes like those of Zuccarelli. One can easily understand how his original ideas were confused with those of the greater men who prompted his gay variations. His is a flame fed by a longing for the eighteenth century which was now dead for all but this extreme enthusiast who kept a place for it in his heart.

I shall be content if I have shown how necessary is the most careful and painstaking enquiry, and if I have persuaded those who love this last great period — a period in which the dying Venice, one small town, proved no less brilliant than France herself — that they must look not only at the greater lights, but also at the lesser and the least. Only thus can our opinions be honest and our judgement on Venetian art worthy of consideration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTISTS

Amigoni, Iacopo: On subject of this artist see G. Fogolari, L'Arte, 1913, pp. 311-317. Important article by H. Voss in Jahrbuch der preuss. Kunstsammlungen, 1918, pp. 145-170. For Venice cf. Lorenzetti's Guide, which is only unreliable in attributing the Anthia and Abrocomas of the Accademia to Amigoni. This cannot be the picture mentioned by Algarotti (Fogolari, Boll. d'Arte, 1907, VII), as it is obviously in the manner of Tiepolo. Perhaps the work of Giulio Cesare Ligari.

Bellotto, Pietro: The old woman, in Stuttgart (Lachesi), is dated 1654; Portrait of the Artist by himself in the Uffizi, signed and dated 1658.

Bison or Bisson, Bernardino: Only mentioned by Da Manzano in his Cenni and the supplementary notes (1885-1887). Supposed to have been a pupil of Romani and of Cedini; no one alludes to his obvious descent from Chiaruttini. His ceilings in the Casa Manzoni at Padua show the influence of Tiepolo. For a note on his later neo-classic period see S. Benco, in Dedalo, 1925-26, p. 799.

Bortoloni, Giambattista: One of the better followers of Balestra. See G. Fiocco, Rivista Mensile di Venezia, April 1927, pp. 173-174.

Brusaferro, Gerolamo: Influenced by Bambini and an imitator of Ricci, see the picture dated 1732 at Mareson di Zoldo Alto (Belluno); cf. H. Voss in Thieme and Becker, Lexikon, V, and G. Fiocco in Rivista di Venezia, November 1925 (Palazzo Pesaro).

Canal, Antonio: Representative of the most academic tendencies in the painting of prospects. H. Voss has attempted to explain his development, Repertorium f. Kunstwissenschaft, 1926, but throws no light upon the retrograde period for which I have given the necessary data and which is easily understood in the light of the invaluable contributions of Hilda Finberg, Canaletto in England (Walpole Society, IX, 1920-21, p. 21 ff. and supplement, ib. X, p. 76). I have reproduced the view of Eton (about 1747), to show the change in Canaletto's art. Whitehall seen from Richmond House, 1746, shows the same tendencies. (Duke of Richmond, Plate XI). The academic type of work was the more successful and is seen in the art of Bellotto (the most delightful of the followers of Canaletto who engraved one of the works of J. v. d. Heyden), as much as in that of Richter and Scott abroad while in Italy it continued up to the time of Moja and the Grubacs. It was taught by Giuseppe and Faustino Moretti of the Val Camonica (Fogolari, L'Arte, 1913, pp. 383-84: Fiocco, Rivista m. di Venezia, April 1927,

p. 169; C. Ricci, Catalogo Pinacoteca di Parma, 1896, p. 356) and by Francesco Tironi, the best of Canaletto's direct followers, recently discovered by H. Voss (Zeitschrift f. bild. Kst., 1926, p. 266 ff.). The excellent Giovanni Migliara (1735-1837) must not be forgotten. I have not dealt with the artists in pure perspective like Antonio Joli, Pietro Gaspari, Antonio Mauri, cold and theoretic followers of the Bibbiena (cf. Fogolari, article on the Venetian Academy, L'Arte, 1913, which is full of information about these lesser artists), nor with Antonio Visentini and Francesco Battaglioli, who were rather followers of Pannini; and as regards the latter of the two I must record that, as can be deduced from the views of Aranjuez mentioned in the text, which are of 1756, he was born at least ten years earlier than is generally stated (1746). For the work in which he collaborated with Zugno cf. H. Voss, Repertorium, 1926, cit.

Michele Marieschi, not to be confused with Iacopo, a pupil of G. Diziani (Fogolari, Boll. d'Arte, 1909, VII; Haumann, loc. cit. p. 50), was not only a landscape artist, but a scene painter and prepares the way for Chiaruttini and Bisson. For Giuseppe Zais, Zuccarelli, the Cignaroli, Antonio Diziani see, besides Fogolari, Haumann. Zuccarelli was sometimes imitated by Bisson and more definitely by Napoleone d'Este in the nineteenth century.

D. v. Hadeln promises a volume of the artist's drawings (Schroll-Vienna), cf. also Burlington Magazine, December 1926.

Carlevaris, Luca, and painters of views: It is of little avail to divide painting into *genres* even in the eighteenth century, but the best critics continue to do so; cf. H. Voss, Studien zur venezianischen Vedutenmalerei des 18. Jahrhunderts, Repertorium f. Kunstwissenschaft, XLVII, 1926, cit. Even Luca Carlevaris, who dealt so much in the mathematics and the perspective of plans for views, executed paintings in other *genres* and specially in landscape. In the same way artists like Spolverini, Simonini, F. Casanova, the Guardi, G. Zais etc. did not confine themselves to painting battle scenes, nor did Angelo Everardi, Faustino Bocchi, Enrico Alberici (or Albrizzi) deal always with Bambocciate.

This habit of dividing painting into different categories has made it difficult for critics to realize that the Venetian view is closely connected with the landscape and with other types. We are concerned here with Carlevaris only as a painter of views who brought the method of Vanvitelli from Rome to Venice and the scheme of work which, with Canaletto, was so successful: see H. Voss, loc. cit. For an account of Carlevaris see P. Paoletti, in Thieme and Becker, Lexikon, V; Moschini, in Letteratura Veneziana III, p. 86 ff., and Canal, Vita del Lazzarini, p. 29.

Carneo, Antonio: Bibliography given by H. Voss in Thieme and Becker, Lexikon, VI, 1912, in which mention is made of Giacomo the Elder, whose existence is denied in our revision and by the documents. For reproductions cf. Th. v. Frimmel, Blätter für Gemäldekunde, V, 1909 (March and April), and W. Suida, Belvedere 1924, 19. Cf. also Sobotka-Woborsky, Zeitschrift f. bildende Kunst, 59th year, p. 94.

Carneo, Giacomo: On this modest follower of his father see Frimmel in art. cit. and O. v. Kutschera in Zeitschrift f. bildende Kunst, 1920, 53rd year. Collaboration with Nicola Grassi is important (cf. G. Lorenzetti, Guide to Venice, cit. p. 846) and apparent in the paintings at Formeaso, in the Mocking of Christ which we reproduce, and specially in the Capture of Princess Ferinda in the Pinacoteca at Ascoli (Ceci bequest) where it is attributed to Strozzi (No. 70).

Carpioni, Giulio: We have only a few notes here and there, e. g. Bollettino d'Arte, 1918, p. 64, and information from general sources like Thieme and Becker, Lexikon, VI (R.). There are two good paintings in the Uffizi in Florence: Neptune and Coronis, and the Child with the basket of fruit and flowers.

Carriera, Rosalba: For bibliography and life see the important work of V. Malamani, R. C., Bergamo, 1910. Mention is made of the Sartori but not of Marianna Carlevaris, mentioned by Moschini in Letteratura Veneziana (pp. 88-111), who does not give her Christian name. Temanza gives this in his Zibaldone. There is a pastel by Francesco Pavona in Pal. Giovanelli (Paolina Contarini); Damerini mentions other works in Casa Mocenigo at S. Stae. I have seen others in Count Zoppola's castle in Friuli. Cf. Fogolari, L'Arte, 1913, pp. 375-376.

Cassana, Niccolò: For his portraits, formerly confused with Salv. Rosa, see B. in Thieme and Becker, Lexikon, VI. In L'Arte, 1910, p. 145, is reproduced the Bacchanal of the Hermitage.

Chiaruttini, Francesco: Antonio Morassi deals with this painter in Jahrbuch d. Kunsthistorischen Institutes der Zentralkommission, Vienna, 1915, pts. I-IV. No mention is made of the paintings in the Tribunal at Tolmezzo, which resemble those in the Palazzo Pontotti at Cividale.

Coli, Giovanni and Filippo Gherardi: cf. H. Voss, Malerei des Barock in Rom, 1924, pp. 577-579. For the paintings in the Library of San Giorgio, Venice, see short work by Don Marco Valle Veneto: Pensieri morali espressi nei cinque quadri stanno nel soffitto della libreria di S. Giorgio Maggiore, 1665. This date is the *terminus ante quem* for these paintings.

Crosato, Giambattista: Fogolari has written on him; L'Arte, cit. p. 247. Worked largely in Piedmont (F. Bartoli, Notizia di pitture, I). For his relation with Pittoni and his work in Venice cf. G. Fiocco, Rivista Mensile di Venezia, November 1925, p. 398 (Palazzo Pesaro), and ibid. pp. 147-148 (April 1927), especially for correction of attributions by Telluccini (Dedalo, July 1925). The Piedmontese, Bernardino Galliari, descends directly from him. The Olindo and Sophronia in the Pinacoteca at Ascoli (No. 10, Ceci Bequest) is by Crosato.

Damini, Vincenzo: L. Serra, Aquila, 1912, pp. 91-92, has written on the work done by D. in Abruzzi. He came from the Venetian district or rather from Venice, according to the signature in S. Agostino at Aquila. Probably a relative of Pietro Damini of Castelfranco and even more probably of Angela Damini who signed the portrait of Gaspare Mansi in Lucca (1741); cf. La Mostra del Ritratto, Bergamo, 1927, p. 212. See also Thieme and Becker, Lexikon, VIII, and Catalogue of the Exhibition of 17th and 18th century art, at Berlin (Wertheim), 1927, p. 15.

Eismann, Johan Anton: Temanza mentions him in his Zibaldone, cit. (cf. Fogolari, L'Arte, 1913, pp. 364-365) noting his quality and his links with Carlo Brisighella, also I. Haumann (Das oberitalienische Landschaftsbild, Strasburg, 1927, p. 28).

Fetti, Domenico: I have adopted the spelling Fetti rather than the usual «Feti», on the authority of A. Luzio (La Galleria Gonzaga, Milan, 1913) whose work on the seventeenth century is always helpful. I still hold, as in previous works, that the artist derives from Orazio Borgianni, which explains the Bassanesque traits in his work which were already marked in this master. M. Endres Soltmann (Dissertation, Munich, 1914), and R. Oldenbourg, Biblioteca d'Arte (Rome, 1921), should be consulted for bibliography and catalogue of works. Oldenbourg goes too far in attributing works to Fetti, a common mistake in early researches. We noted the Elijah in Berlin as the work of Maffei and that the portrait of the actor Gabrielli, in Venice, is a copy, and the same applies to the Tobias in Verona etc. We shall not add to the list as this would in no way modify our judgement of the artist. See on this point a good essay by M. Marangoni (Dedalo, 1923) which however deals with Fetti apart from Venetian art. Voss, however, does not include him in his most useful volume on baroque painting at Rome (Berlin, 1924). Cf. also Belvedere, 1926 (47-48), for a few new attributions.

Flipart, Giuseppe: The importance of Alessandro Longhi, who in portrait-painting is the forerunner through Goya of French art of the seventies, as Francesco Guardi, through Bonington and Turner, is a forerunner in *plein air* landscape painting, is seen in these artists, who derive from him and introduced his manner

into other countries. G. Flipart succeeded Tiepolo in Spain after 1770: cf. G. Fiocco, Bollettino d'Arte, July 1925 (Lorenzo Tiepolo). Similarly Traversi, with whom I dealt, distinguishing him from Bonito (Rivista m. di Venezia, April 1927, p. 147), is connected with Longhi, and is of interest here only as the artist through whom that manner spread to France. A Neapolitan and a follower of Solimena, only two of his paintings, of the year 1749, are in his native city in Santa Maria dell'Aiuto. His work appears frequently in France, however (*e. g.* at Rouen, four paintings: one in the museum and three in private collections), whence came the pictures I saw in Vienna seven years ago in the possession of Prof. Maurer (Academy). The Vita Artistica 11-12, 1927, reproduced these pictures which are signed «Gaspar Traversi» like the two (not eight) at Naples. The Vita Artistica (August-September 1927) has also an important article by R. Longhi on this artist. Longhi however does not emphasize his relations with Alessandro which seem to me to be of the greatest importance.

Forabosco, Gerolamo: Further to H. Voss and W. von Kutschera in Thieme and Becker, Lex. XII, 1916, pp. 197-198, see G. Fiocco, Belvedere, January 1926, pt. 43 (with documents), and again H. Voss, Belvedere, 1926, 50. In spite of these publications (cf. Catalogue of the Berlin Exhibition, Wertheim, 1927) L. Ozzola has recently republished in «Der Cicerone» the «Menichina padovana» (the Museum of Padua has a small replica) as a work of Velasquez, while Longhi mentions the Borghese Venus as a possible Titian.

Fumiani, Antonio: The Punishment of Ananias in the Uffizi at Florence is a very beautiful work, and the background is also of interest.

Grassi, Nicola: Da Manzano is the only writer to point out that this artist certainly came from Carnia. He was born at Formeaso, April 9th 1682, and died there, as the beginning of his will, dictated in Venice September 29th 1741, proves, probably in 1749 (Arch. di Stato, Atti Francesco Arduini, No. 374, B. 2). His works are to be found at Formeaso, Sezza, Tolmezzo, Ampezzo and Fielis in Carnia. There is, further, the Sacrifice of Isaac, certainly his, a contrast to a Pittoni in the School of S. Francesco della Vigna, a Flagellation in the Art Gallery at Budapest (attributed to Pellegrini), and the five works in the Ceci bequest (four coming from Arta in Carnia and attributed to D. Maggiotto) in the Pinacoteca at Ascoli. See also under Carneo, Giacomo; cf. G. Fiocco, Dedalo, 1929.

Guardi, Francesco: The view and landscape in the eighteenth-century art of Venice are crowned in the work of Guardi whose landscape is pure in the modern sense (Rio dei Mendicanti, Laguna etc.). For bibliography see Simonson, London,

1904 and my work (Franc. Guardi, Florence, Battistelli, 1923). The old belief that he was a follower of Canaletto is there refuted and it is shown that he was a follower of the Ricci, through his brother Gianantonio, and like him a figure-painter when necessary. The objections to this theory are dealt with one by one. Both relationships are proved by documents (Dedalo, January 1926). Figure paintings, signed by Fr. Guardi, have been rediscovered (Burlington Magazine, May 1925); there has been no notice yet of the discovery of the bust of a Saint which I have given to the museum of Trento. The inscription on the back states that it comes from the neighbourhood of Vigo d'Anaunia and shows that the small altar-piece in the parish church is correctly assigned. Baron D. von Hadeln reproduced in the Burlington Magazine (May 1927) two figures, almost lifesize, on wood, having a seascape with figures at the back — fully dated and signed (1747). I showed in the same publication that these were the two side panels of the organ of San Raffaele — the starting point of all my research (Rassegna d'Arte 1919, p. 223). All Guardi's experience tended to make his work the *non plus ultra* of Venetian paintings in sense of colour and space. I am increasingly convinced that much of his fame as a painter of views should be shared by his brother Niccolò, who worked on the lines of Canaletto, and I believe that four of the eight landscapes in the Academy at Vienna are typical works of his.

Langetti, Giambattista: For Langetti and the so-called naturalism of the time at Venice, see G. Fiocco, Dedalo, October 1922. To paintings given there and in the text we have only to add the Card Players in the Uffizi at Florence. and a picture in the Kunsthistorisches Museum at Vienna.

Liberi, Pietro: The precise date is taken from the Register of Deaths (Arch. di Stato, Venezia, No. 101) and from records of the parish church of S. Samuele near the church of Santo Stefano.

Liss, Giovanni: R. Oldenbourg, Biblioteca Illustrata (Rome 1921) is still an essential bibliography; to which one may add R. A. Peltzer, Zeitschrift f. bild. Kunst, 1925, pp. 161-164, which is excellent on the birthplace of the artist. See A. Colasanti, Bollettino d'Arte, 1921-22; A. Morassi, l'Arte, 1923, II-III, and J. Zarnowski, Belvedere, 1925, 40, for other works attributed to Liss, all of which cannot be accepted: the Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane formerly at Trieste (Morassi) is dated and signed by Liss, while the David in the Accademia at Venice appears to be the work of Fetti, although formerly attributed to Liss (Colasanti), and the Sacrifice of Isaac, Moscow, is certainly the work of P. Pagani (Zarnowski). The copies, too are not all original, for whereas those of the Prodigal Son in

Vienna (Academy) and Utrecht (see 1899, Oud Holland, XIII, 36) appear to be quite good, the same can certainly not be said of the one in the Uffizi. To these works one can only add the Hercules at the Parting of the Ways recently acquired by the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden.

LONGHI, ALESSANDRO: Further to text see Bollettino d'Arte cit. (G. Fiocco). G. Damerini (I pittori veneziani del 700, Bologna, 1928) gives some information as to Longhi's life, but this work should be accepted with caution as it excludes Tiepolo (the greatest of Venetian rococo painters) from the eighteenth century and — to give one example of the kind of error — reproduces as the work of A. Longhi the most beautiful portrait by Tiepolo (p. 100).

LONGHI, PIETRO: See the monograph of Aldo Ravà (Bergamo, 1909) revised in second edition 1923 (Idea, Florence), which also gives bibliography. For Flipart and Alessandro Longhi see under their names. The new drawings acquired by Berlin and that of the Accademia in Venice (Boll. d'Arte, March 1928) are of the greatest importance. Pietro Longhi is the father of all *genre* painting (Gobbis, Gianantonio and Francesco Guardi and Marco Marcola). In this type of work Longhi holds not only from Crespi but also from G. Gambarini, another painter from Bologna about whom Voss has recently written (Pantheon, 1928).

LOTH, CARLO: Account by H. Voss in Zeitschrift f. bildende Kunst. 1912, pp. 69-72. See also Dedalo, October 1922.

MAFFEI, FRANCESCO: Cf. G. Fiocco, Dedalo, September 1924. A study of the painting in the manner of Velasquez in the National Gallery: «The Betrothal», leads me to believe that it is not by M., but by the versatile Luca Giordano.
I found many works by M. in the Emilian Galleries: The Horsemen of the Apocalypse and the Angels and Devils at Rimini (second room); the Salome at Faenza, still attributed to Tiepolo! There is a Conversion of St. Paul at Pesaro (Pinacoteca) given as the work of P. Testa. Dr. Arslan tells me of two Saints in the Casa del Clero at Padua and Sig. Porcello of a Crucifixion of St. John in Patmos, formerly in the Ognissanti there and now in the Immacolata.

MARIOTTI, GIAMBATTISTA: See, besides the Guide by Lorenzetti, O. Giglioli, Bollettino d'Arte, April 1927, on this pupil of Balestra.

MAROLÌ, DOMENICO: Boschini, who engraved one of his landscapes, talks of M., otherwise only E. Mauceri, Bollettino d'Arte, September 1926, who speaks of him as a Greek, born at Messina, who married a Venetian woman and returned to his native town about the year 1660, where he died 23rd May, 1676.

Mazza, Damiano: Cf. Detlev von Hadeln, D. M. in Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst, N. F. XXIV pt. II, pp. 249-254. See also the thesis by Dr. Andrea Ferrari, Il Padovanino, R. University of Padua, 1920 (shortly to be published in the Bulletin of the Padua Museum), specially for the date of M.'s death.

Mazzoni, Sebastiano: Cf. G. Fiocco, Dedalo, October 1928.

Mola, Pierfrancesco: H. Voss has dealt with this interesting painter in Rivista arch. della provincia di Como, 1910, p. 176 ff. and in the work cit., pp. 559-562. L. Ozzola, Bollettino d'Arte, 1911, insists that the Homer of the Accademia is Mola's work. One need add nothing further to the bibliography except W. Arslan, Bollettino d'Arte, August 1928. He worked in close connection with Fetti (pictures in the Aldo Ravà collection and the Old Woman in the Barberini collection); with Liss (Preaching of St. John the Baptist, Louvre) and Strozzi (Old Woman spinning, Gall. di S. Luca, Rome; Diogenes in the Spinelli collection, Florence; and the Baptist as a child, attributed to Liss, in the Accademia, Venice).

Morlaiter, Michelangelo: An unimportant artist well known in Venice and in his crude ceiling of Candiana (Padua). See Bollettino d'Arte, October 1927, specially for the distinction between M. and Alessandro Longhi (G. Fiocco).

Padovanino, Chiara Varotari, Dario Varotari: A. Moschetti: L'Autoritratto del Padovanino, Padua, 1899; V. Brocchi, Il Padovanino, Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 1899,1900 (an essay of little value). Dr. Andrea Ferrari in the thesis previously mentioned gives evidence for P's independence of Dario Varotari, a follower of Veronese in the manner of Montemezzano, and fully supports me in tracing P's descent from Mazza. Catalogue, Exhibition of 17th and 18th century art, Wertheim, Berlin, May and June 1927.

Pagani, Paolo: H. Voss has written recently on this Lombard artist from Valsolda, Belvedere, 1929. An artist who started from Liberi and Ruschi and linked himself with the school of so-called «naturalists». Strongly resembles Nicola Grassi in certain effects (The Mockery of Job and The Mockery of Christ, citt.). I can only add one to the works mentioned by Voss, a half figure of St. Jerome as a penitent; it is similar to the one in the Liechtenstein Gallery, formerly in the possession of the artist Carletti, in Venice. No. 213 in the Academy in Vienna, noted by Voss (the idolatrous Solomon) seems to me to be, rather, by Celesti.

Palma, Iacopo (Giovane, Negretti): Cf. for his designs and those of other mannerists: D. v. Hadeln, Cassirer, Berlin, 1926.

Pellegrini, Gianantonio: Further to information given in the text and in Lorenzetti's Guide cf. G. Fiocco, op. cit. pp. 149-150.

Piatti, Santo: Besides the picture in San Moisè and the sketch in the possession of the Armenians at Venice (Exhibition of the 17th and 18th Centuries No. 737) there are two paintings in San Simeone Piccolo (G. Fiocco, Rivista Mensile di Venezia, April 1927, p. 174). There are four oval paintings, with writing on the back, of Old Testament subjects, in a private collection in Venice. The Crucifixion in the Exhibition of 17th and 18th Century Italian Art in Berlin (Wertheim) 1927, No. 157, seems to me to be Piatti's work.

Piazzetta, Giambattista: The only monograph we possess (Aldo Ravà, Idea, Florence, 1921) shows how rash it is to enter into a discussion about G. B. Piazzetta without a full knowledge of his predecessors and of the artists who follow him. The importance of his descent from Molinari, and so from Zanchi, has not been realized, and his works have been confused with those of pupils and imitators. The supposed sketch for the ceiling of SS. Giov. e Paolo (Rome, Comm. Pogliani) is at the most a work of Domenico Maggiotto, like the Pilgrims and the Fruitsellers (pp. 75-76): the Maddalena on p. 69 is by Giulia Lama; and the S. Lorenzo Giustiniani on p. 71 by Chioggiotto (cf. the altar-piece at the Pietà). The paintings mentioned on pp. 45, 46, 72, 73 etc. are quite unworthy of him; the Annunciation at Frankfort is by G. B. Pittoni and the Esau selling his birthright and the painting of Eliezer and Rebecca (pp. 80-81) are by Francesco Cappella (Barozzi Collection, Venice).

To understand the difficulty of attributing these works correctly we must realize that while the exquisite sketch representing «two peasant girls tickling a sleeping youth» (Ravà, p. 32) in the Brass Collection is by the master, the picture suggested by it and painted in 1745 is the work of Giuseppe Angeli, and that the inscription *direttore della bottega di Giambattista* which declared its authorship has been erased. The work was formerly at Baden, near Vienna, and is mentioned in Österreichische Kunsttopographie, 1924, Vol. 18, Baden.

For Giuseppe Angeli, an overrated follower, see Fogolari, Arte, 1913, p. 258; for D. Maggiotto, ibid. p. 261; for Chioggiotto (Antonio Marinetti) G. Fiocco, Rivista di Venezia, April 1927, p. 163; for Giulia Lama, ibid. p. 165, and G. Fiocco in Rivista d'Arte, I, 1929; for Francesco Polazzo, Lorenzetti's Guide, p. 409, and G. Fiocco, op. cit., p. 173.

For Francesco Cappella (Daggiù) see Rivista di Venezia, cit. p. 163, and a few articles by A. Pinetti. I do not speak of the confusion with Felice Cignaroli over

the Romanelli Portrait (Paris) of which Prof. Laurenti in Venice has a replica. To the bibliography given by Ravà should be added G. Fiocco, Dedalo, 1921, p. 101 ff. and Rivista di Venezia, cit. pp. 165-166. I do not know why Baudi di Vesme should have corrected the date of Piazzetta's death to 1753 as there is no doubt that he died on April 28th 1754 (Le peintre graveur italien, p. 370).

Pittoni, Giambattista: L. Coggiola Pittoni, a descendant of the painter, has written on Pittoni: Dei Pittoni artisti veneti, 1907, Bergamo; and there are further contributions (Emporium, January 1912; Rassegna d'Arte, 1912, p. 20; Bollettino d'Arte, 1913, III; Rassegna d'Arte 1914, p. 169; Illustrazione Italiana, New Year number, 1924-25; Rivista Mensile di Venezia, November 1925 etc.). The most important, however, are a little volume in the series Piccola coll. d'Arte, Florence, 1921 and «Opere inedite di G. B. Pittoni» in Dedalo VIII, p. 671 ff. A great many of the drawings, now in the Accademia in Venice, I recognized in the possession of Baron Salvotti at Mori (Trentino), Bollettino d'Arte, March 1928. All the works attributed to him should not be accepted as his. H. Voss made corrections regarding the round canvases with the Life of the Virgin Mary (Repertorium, cit. 1926; Rass. d'Arte, 1914, p. 170). No study has been made of his descent from Nicola Grassi and the marked influence of G. B. Tiepolo.

Amongst the works attributed to Pittoni (Pittoni, ed. 1921 cit.), that given as his, the St. Helena at Verona (Museum), is by Fontebasso; the Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane in the Liechtenstein Gallery is by Ricci and the four pictures in the Volpini collection at Leghorn are by Matteo Bonechi. The Triumph of Diana in the Seminary at Rovigo is signed G. Diziani; etc.

Renieri, Niccolò, and Michele Desubleo: On Renieri see Voss (op. cit. pp. 479-480); on Desubleo, G. Sobotka, Thieme and Becker, Lexikon, IV. Neither gives us the relationship between the two artists. For this see Renieri's will (Venice, Arch. di Stato, Sez. Not. Lion Camillo, B. 591, No. 125), published November 20th of the same year. The will mentions the daughters: Lucrezia (wife of D. Van Dyck), Clorinda (wife of P. Vecchia), Angelica, the son Giampaolo and the half-brother «Michele Desubleau who is now living in Parma». It mentions his collection of pictures and paintings of flowers, which he left to Angelica wife of Gerolamo Galli. In addition to the works mentioned above and by Voss, there is a typical Cleopatra of his at Pesaro in the Museo Mosca.

Ricci, Marco, and the origins of the «paesaggio di fantasia»: As Voss has made a special study of the views, Irene Haumann has dedicated a careful volume cit. to the beginnings of landscape painting (Das oberitalienische Landschaftsbild des

Settecento, Heitz, Strasburg, 1927). Work has not been made easier by extending the scope of the enquiry. The views and the landscape derive from Vanvitelli, and many different kinds — the ruins typical of Pannini, the battle scenes like Borgognone's, landscapes like those of Salvator Rosa and Tempesta — become true painting in Venice where they established themselves as art regained its power in the use of colour. The modern lansdcape dates from Marco, from the teaching he had from his uncle Sebastiano and his appreciation of his great forerunner, Alessandro Magnasco, whose most worthy follower he was in all his work — his own and that done in collaboration with his uncle. Through them the work of Magnasco becomes not an episode but a chapter in the history of painting, which through Guardi culminates in the modern school. For their collaboration see H. Voss in Repertorium loc. cit., and the Waterfall with little figures in the Mauroner collection in the Castello of Udine where it is assigned to Magnasco. For Zuccarelli, Marieschi and Zais cf. Fogolari and Haumann; for Battaglioli, Voss (Repertorium, 1926) and Haumann. No one has written on F. Casanova's Venetian period. He derives from Marco and from Simonini and belonged to the school of Gianantonio Guardi (cf. my volume on F. Guardi).

Ricci, Sebastiano: The volume by Joachim v. Derschau, Heidelberg, 1922, is essential for study of Ricci and further A. Morassi, Un libro di disegni e due quadri di S. R., in Cronache d'Arte, September-October 1926. Does not develop fully the reciprocal influence between R. and Magnasco about whom we have only one earlier volume by B. Geiger (Vienna 1923) which is not to be relied upon in the attribution of works, and a small volume of the Biblioteca d'Arte by Armando Ferri (Rome 1922). Recently A. Sambon, writing of a Magnasco exhibition (Paris 1929), distinguishes various styles of his, but without referring to the essential matter of the reciprocal relations between him and Ricci.

Ruschi, Francesco: See Temanza in his Zibaldone and Melchiori in his Lives. For his relations with Mazzoni cf. Dedalo, October 1928, and for his connection with Zanchi, Loth etc., Dedalo, October 1922.

Saraceni, Carlo: See H. Voss, Malerei des Barock in Rom, Berlin, 1924, pp. 448-452; also for Le Clerc. For Elsheimer and his relations with Carlo Saraceni which date perhaps from Venice cf. W. Bode, A. E., Munich, 1920, and Voss, Zeitschr. für bildende Kunst, 1911-12. The recent article on Saraceni by A. Porcella, Rivista mensile della città di Venezia, September 1928, is of the utmost importance. At Santa Giustina, near Feltre, there is an Annunciation of his, signed and dated 1621.

Stroiffi, Ermanno: Further to what is given in the text, the David and Isaiah in the Ateneo in Venice should be noted. See G. Fiocco, Dedalo, October 1922, specially on the altar-piece at the Ospedaletto. The date of his birth, 1616, is recorded in the register of deaths (Necrologio No. 899) and testified to by Flaminio Corner (III, p. 233). The date 1625 on the altar-piece of the Ospedaletto (Dedalo, cit. p. 276)is therefore doubtful. The paintings in the oratory of the convent of La Fava are his, and concern, as I have said, San Filippo Neri.

Strozzi, Bernardo: Besides the bibliography given in my little volume in Biblioteca d'Arte Illustrata, 1921, see P. Francesco Saverio, I Cappuccini genovesi, I, 1921, where he proves that Strozzi was never imprisoned. Consult also: G. Fiocco, Dedalo, 1922, p. 646, for the Venetian period; O. Grosso, Rassegna d'Arte, 1922, and Emporium, 1923, VI; Napoli Nobilissima, 1922, I and II; M. Labò, Il Comune di Genova, July 31st 1924 and April 30th 1925; G. Delogu, L'Arte, 1929, I; V. Lasareff: Beiträge zu B. S. (Der Cicerone, 1929); G. Fiocco in Il Santo, Padua, I, 1929. What we learn in the text of Ermanno Stroiffi shows how careful one must be in accepting works attributed to these artists: the Sleeping Child, for instance, in the Czernin collection, identified by Suida (the work in Grenoble where the child is given as a Christ is a copy), or the Concert, formerly in the possession of the Maggioni (Legnago), which is the original of the so-called Devonshire Caravaggio (L'Arte, 1929, cit.). For the portrait of the poet Strozzi confused with the Capuchin, see, in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, under Vouet, Simon, c. 137, vol. A A 1 3 5, the inscription misinterpreted «In Voeti manu pictam Strozzae imaginem. Quod licuit fatis, audax natura peregit. Quicquid naturæ mens facit Artificis». To which has been added «Simon Vouet delin. Venetie 1627. Mi. Lasne fecit, Paris» (cf. Il Santo, pp. 24-29). The portrait of an old woman (Florence, private collection) shows direct influence of Velasquez, and it may even be a copy of a work of his.

Tempesta, Pietro: (Pieter Muliers). Important influence in the development of Marco Ricci. His «Tempests» (there is one in the Segrè-Sartorio collection at Trieste) are typical of all Venetian work of this kind in the eighteenth century. Arthur Sambon reproduces one in Figaro Artistique, I, November 1928, as the work of Francesco Guardi: cf. Haumann, cit. p. 15.

Tiepolo, Giambattista: There are besides the important monographs of Sack (1910) and Molmenti (ed. cit., French ed. 1911) a volume also by Molmenti, on Tiepolo's engravings (Venice, Ongania, 1896); a more careful study by Baudi di Vesme (Le peintre graveur italien, Milan, 1906, p. 376 ff.); two volumes on his draw-

ings by von Hadeln (ed. Pantheon 1927) to which one need only add the unknown group in the Museo Bardini at Florence and another formerly belonging to the Cicognara-Canova collection and now to Count A. Contini, Rome. The most important studies are: Voss, Kunst und Künstler, September 1928, and Fogolari, Bollettino d'Arte, August 1923. Both maintain that the four paintings in the Accademia, formerly attributed to Ricci, are the work of T. at the time when he was most influenced by R. I have frequently stated my belief that it is rather the work of a collaborator working with the master, while in Udine, Francesco Fontebasso: cf. pictures at Trento and the so-called «Book of Tiepolo» in Berlin (Kristeller, Kunst and Künstler, July 1912). See also Rivista m. di Venezia, April 1927, pp. 156-158. On the close collaboration with his son, Giandomenico, there is an interesting reference by P. Edwards (ms. Biblioteca del Seminario, Venice 787-8) who says of the altar-piece at Mirano: «The group of persons and the architecture are by the elder Tiepolo, the figure of St. Anthony by the younger». The bozzetto of Giambattista is now in the possession of Comm. E. Modiano, Bologna.

As regards the so-called sketches, besides those which are definitely counterfeit and therefore to be excluded, of which I have mentioned the sketch, formerly in Trieste, for the Artaria Birth of Venus now in Dresden (H. Posse, Zeitschrift f. bild. Kunst. 91, 12), and without considering the ugly little picture of the Martyrdom of St. Agatha, of which Dr. Oreste Sartorio has a replica in Trieste, I will only mention the best: the sketch for an altar-piece for S. Massimo in Padua (representing the saints Massimo and Osvaldo), of which I have seen three versions, in London, in the Accademia Carrara at Bergamo, and in the Thieme collection in San Remo (cf. Sack for the first two and Molmenti for the third). In the last picture the only variant is the suppression of the lamp-stand, suppression which is clearly visible.

There will, however, be no complete study of this great master until the question of his pupils and followers has been thoroughly cleared up. As regards the Lombards, we know something of Giustino Menescardi (G. Fiocco, op. cit. pp. 151-153); very little of Giulio Cesare and Pietro Ligari (Molmenti, French edition, p. 58, and Bassi, Guida della Valtellina, 1911), a little more of the colourless Biagio Bellotti (G. Nicodemi, Busto Arsizio, s. d.). Giandomenico Tiepolo can always be recognized by a chalky whiteness in his work, but his figure-painting, as one can easily understand, tends to be confused with that of his father. Lorenzo, also a son and to some extent a follower, is overestimated by A. L. Mayer (Bollettino d'Arte, March 1925): this attempt is replied to in Bollettino d'Arte, July

1925 (Fiocco). Francesco Fontebasso is fairly well known (H. Voss, Jahrbuch für Kunstsammler, 1923, III, and G. Fiocco, op. cit., pp. 156-158), but there is still work to be done on the sketch-book attributed to Tiepolo himself, in Berlin, with memories of Udine at the time of his closest collaboration with his master, shown in the many frescoes in the archbishop's palace and by the works formerly at Povo and now at Trento. More is known of the subtle Francesco Zugno (H. Voss, Repertorium f. Kunstwiss, 1926, and Fiocco, op. cit. pp. 143-146). There has been nothing written on Francesco Lorenzi, called Lorenzino, but his works in Verona, his native town, and others which I have seen in Venice in a private collection amongst which there is a little Madonna, signed, show him trying to graft the manner of Tiepolo on to that of Balestra. A typical little altar-piece of his is in the Museo Poldi Pezzoli at Milan, attributed to Giandomenico.

Tinelli, Tiberio: cf. A. L. Mayer in Bollettino d'Arte, April 1924.

Turchi, Alessandro, Pasquale Ottino and Marcantonio Bassetti: cf. R. Longhi, Vita Artistica, November 1926 and Voss, Zeitschr. f. bildende Kunst, 1912, p. 68. For the relations between these Veronese artists and Stroiffi see works given under Saraceni (Porcella, p. 375, and letter to Palma Giovane in Bottari, May 6th, 1616).

Vecchia, Pietro: A. Porcella in his Saraceni makes a first attempt to catalogue the works of Vecchia. A typical work of his is the Conversion of St. Matthew, a drawing in the Uffizi, once attributed to Giorgione (Knackfuss series, 1908, p. 63), as usual in the style of Romanino.

Zanchi, Antonio: Cf. Dedalo, October 1922, article on Langetti (Fiocco). For dates and careful tracing of his work in Italy, A. Riccoboni, Rassegna d'Arte, April 1922, pp. 109-119, is indispensable. In Emporium, December 1922, there is a reproduction of the beautiful painting in S. Maria Maggiore at Bergamo: Moses drawing water from the rock. He obviously has much in common with Carpioni, through the influence of Ruschi. Cf. also G. Pietrogrande, Biografie Estensi, Padua, 1881, p. 81 ff.

Zaniberti, Filippo: The Rape of the Sabine Women in the Mobili di San Giovanni collection is a typical work (Catalogue, Milan, 1929, No. 113).

Zompini, Gaetano: See small work by Oreste Battistella, Treviso, 1929. Fogolari was the first to discuss his work, L'Arte, 1913, p. 248, mentioning pictures from S. Luca, Venice, signed and dated 1736, now in the castle of Count Tiele at Moschen, Prussia. Dealt with, further, by G. Fiocco, Rivista di Venezia, cit. pp. 166-167. His work always shows the influence of Bambini.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

BARTSCH, ADAM - *Le peintre graveur.* Leipzig, 1866-70, Vol. 21.

BASEGGIO - *Biografie di illustri bassanesi.* Bassano, 1853.

BOSCHINI, MARCO - *La carta del Navegar Pitoresco.* Venice, 1660.

BOTTARI, G., and S. TICOZZI - *Raccolta di lettere sulla pittura etc.* Milan, 1822, Vol. 8.

Catalogo dell'Esposizione di pittura italiana del 17 e 18 secolo. Berlin, May-June 1927 (Wertheim).

Catalogo dell'Esposizione del Seicento e Settecento (edited by A. Riccoboni). Trieste, 1925.

Catalogo della Mostra dei Sei-Settecento a Firenze. Bestetti and Tumminelli, Milan, 1922 (first and second editions).

CRICO, LORENZO - *Lettere sulle belle arti trivigiane.* Treviso, 1833.

DA CANAL, VINCENZO - *Vita di Gregorio Lazzarini* (written in 1732). Edited by Moschini, Venice, 1800. (Deals with the beginnings of a large part of eighteenth-century Venetian painting).

DAL POZZO, BARTOLOMEO - *Le vite de' pittori, degli scultori e architetti veronesi.* Verona, 1717.

DA MANZANO, FRANCESCO - *Cenni biografici dei letterati e artisti friulani.* Udine, 1858. *Nuovi cenni biografici.* Ib., 1887.

DAMERINI, GINO - *I pittori veneziani del 700.* Bologna, 1928.

DE BONI, FILIPPO - *Biografia degli artisti.* Venice, 1840.

DE RENALDIS, GIROLAMO - *Della pittura friulana.* Udine, 1798.

DE VESME, ALEXANDRE - *Le peintre graveur italien.* Milan, 1906.

DI MANIAGO, FABIO - *Storia delle belle arti friulane.* Udine, 1823 (second edition).

Encyclopaediae and dictionaries of art: S. Ticozzi (1818). - P. Zani (1819). - A. Siret (1883). - L. Meyer (1885). - Bryan (1904). - G. K. Nagler (1904). - U. Thieme and F. Becker (1907-1928). - I. Errera (1913).

FEDERICI, DOMENICO MARIA - *Memorie trevigiane sulle opere di disegno.* Venice, 1803.

FENAROLI, STEFANO - *Dizionario degli artisti bresciani.* Brescia, 1877.

FOGOLARI, GINO - *L'Accademia Veneziana di pittura e scultura del Settecento.* L'Arte 1913. Other contributions: Bollettino d'Arte, 1907, VII. - Ib. 1907, V. - Emporium, 1911, 77. *G. B. Tiepolo nel Veneto* (Piccolo Cicerone Moderno). Milan, 1912.

GAMBA - *Catalogo degli artisti bassanesi viventi.* Bassano, 1807.

GAMBA - *De' bassanesi illustri.* Bassano, 1807.

GUALANDI, MICHELANGELO - *Nuova raccolta di lettere sulla pittura etc.* Bologna, 1844. Vol. 3.

Guides to Venetia and neighbouring regions:
Bergamo - Pasta (1755); Mazzoleni (1909).
Brescia - Averoldo (1700); Brognoli (1826); Odorici (1853).
Padua - Rossetti (1776); Brandolese (1795); Moschini (1817); Ronchi (1922). - A. Gloria, *Territorio padovano* (1862-67).
Rovigo - Bartoli (1793).
Treviso - Rigamonti (1776); Santalena (1894); Coletti (series «Italia Artistica», Bergamo; s. a.)
Venice - Boschini (ed. II, 1674); Zanetti (1733); Moschini (1815); Lorenzetti (1927).
Verona - Lanceni (1720); Da Persico (1820); Simeoni (1909).
Vicenza - Boschini (1677); Vendramin-Mosca (1779); Bortolan-Rumor (1919).

LANZI, LUIGI - *Storia pittorica dell'Italia.* Milan, 1831 (first edition, twelve volumes: Bassano, 1789).

LONGHI, ALESSANDRO - *Compendio delle vite dei pittori veneziani.* Venice, 1762.

MARIETTE, PIERRE JEAN - *Abecedario* (published in the «Archives de l'Art Français»), six volumes. Paris, 1853-62.

MIARI, FLORIO - *Dizionario storico, artistico, letterario bellunese.* Belluno, 1843.

MOSCHINI, GIANANTONIO - *Della letteratura veneziana del sec. XVIII.* Four volumes. Venice, 1806.

MOSCHINI, GIANANTONIO - *Dell'incisione in Venezia* (edited by Accademia di Belle Arti). Venice, 1924.

OJETTI, DAMI, TARCHIANI - *La pittura italiana del Seicento e del Settecento alla mostra del Palazzo Pitti.* Milan, 1924 (full bibliography).

ORLANDI, PELLEGRINO ANTONIO - *Abecedario pittorico* (edited by Pietro Guarienti, with additions). Venice, 1753.

PASSAVANT, I. D. - *Le peintre graveur.* Leipzig, 1860-64, Vol. 6.

PELLEGRINI, Ab. Prof. FRANCESCO - *Catalogo dei pittori bellunesi (indigeni e forestieri) del secolo XIV in poi. - Catalogo cronologico degli scultori e degli incisori bellunesi.* Parma, 22nd October, 1892.

PIETROGRANDE, GIACOMO - *Biografie Estensi.* Padua, 1881.

PIETRUCCI, NAPOLEONE - *Biografia degli artisti padovani.* Padua, 1858.

RIDOLFI, CARLO - *Le Meraviglie dell'Arte.* (Ed. Hadeln) Berlin, 1914 (I), 1924 (II). (Original Edition, Venice, 1648).

RUSCONI, J. A. - *La mostra dei disegni del Sei e del Settecento agli Uffizi.* Dedalo, III, 584.

SANDRART, JOACHIM VON - *Teutsche Academie.* Nuremberg, 1675 (two vols.).

Serie degli Uomini più illustri nella Pittura, Scultura e Architettura. Firenze, 1769-75 (twelve parts). - Supplement 1767.

TASSI, FRANCESCO MARIA - *Vite de' pittori, scultori e architetti bergamaschi.* Bergamo, 1793.

TICOZZI - *Storia dei letterati e degli artisti del dipartimento della Piave.* Belluno, 1813.

VECELLIO, ANTONIO - *I pittori feltrini.* Feltre, 1898.

VERCI, GIAMBATTISTA - *Elogio di Bartolomeo Ferracina.* Together with *Vite dei pittori bassanesi.* Venice, 1777.

VOSS, HERMANN - *Repertorium f. Kunstwiss.*, 1910, 213. - *Zeitschrift f. bild. Kst.*, December 1911. - *Munich Year Book of Painting*, 1911, 235.

WAAGEN, H. - *Treasure of Art in Great Britain.* London, 1854.

WALPOLE, HORACE - *Anecdotes of painting in England.* Strawberry Hill, 1762-71, five volumes. - Wornum, 1876.

ZANETTI, ANTON MARIA - *Della Pittura Veneziana.* Venice, 1771.

ZANNANDREIS, DIEGO - *Le vite de' pittori, scultori e architetti veronesi.* Verona, 1891.

MANUSCRIPTS

Brandolese, P., and G. de Lazara - *Oggetti di Belle Arti nel territorio di Padova.* Ms. Guinzato, Archivio Curia Vescovile, Padua.

Dalla Rosa, Saverio - *Catastico delle Pitture etc. di Verona,* 1803. Verona, Biblioteca Comunale, No. 1008.

Melchiori, Natale - *Le vite de' Pittori veneti e dello Stato.* Biblioteca Marciana, Mss. It. Cl. IV, CLXVII (5110).

Moschini, Gianantonio - *Viaggio per l'antico territorio di Padova,* 1809. Sovraintendenza alle Belle Arti, Venice.

Temanza, Tommaso - *Zibaldon di Memorie Storiche appartenenti a Professori delle belle arti del Disegno.* 1738. Biblioteca del Seminario Patriarcale, Venice, Cod. N. CCCLXI, M. M. 3.

INDEX OF ARTISTS

Adler, Salomon (of Danzig), 49.
Albani, Francesco, 34.
Alberici (or Albrizzi), Enrico, 50, 74.
Amigoni, Iacopo, 55, 58, 73.
Amorosi, Antonio, 14, 33, 41.
Angeli, Giuseppe, 69, 81.
Anselmi, Giorgio, 47.
Apollonio, Iacopo, 4.

Baciccia (Giambattista Gaulli), 56.
Baglione, Giovanni, 9.
Balestra, Antonio 47, 53, 73, 79, 86.
Ballini, Camillo, 7.
Bambini, Niccolò, 28, 47, 73, 86.
Bassano, The, 4, 6, 15, 18, 27, 76.
Bassano, Francesco, 4.
Bassano, Gerolamo, 4.
Bassano, Iacopo, 4, 5, 8, 13, 16.
Bassano, Leandro, 4, 29.
Bassetti, Marcantonio, 86.
Battaglioli, Francesco, 66, 74, 83.
Bazzani, Giuseppe, 70.
Bellini, Gentile, 4, 51.
Bellini, Giovanni, 3.
Bellotti, Biagio, 85.
Bellotto, Bernardo, 45.
Bellotto, Pietro (da Volciano), 45-46, 73.
Bellotto, Pietro (Canaletto), 45-46.
Bellucci, Antonio, 44, 47-48, 56.
Bergamasco (G. B. Castello), 21.
Bernini, Giovanni Lorenzo, 17.
Berrettini, Pietro (called Cortona), 32, 38, 39, 42, 44, 52, 56.
Bibbiena, The, 64, 74.
Bisson (or Bison), Bernardino, 72, 73, 74.
Bocchi, Faustino, 50, 74.
Boldrini, Niccolò, 61.
Bombelli, Sebastiano, 2, 29, 40, 41, 48-49, 71.
Bonazza, Antonio, 52.
Bonechi, Matteo, 82.
Bonifacio (dei Pitati), 5, 7.
Bonington, 76.
Bonito, Giuseppe, 71, 77.
Bordone, Paris, 5.
Borgianni, Orazio, 14, 15, 76.
Borgognone (Guglielmo Courtois) 50, 51, 82.
Borromini, Francesco, 1, 8.
Bortoloni, Giambattista, 73.
Bortoloni, Mattia, 47.
Bosch, Hieronymus, 50.
Brandt, Heinrich Carl, 71.
Brisighella, Carlo, 50, 76.
Brueghel, Pieter, 16.
Brusaferro, Gerolamo, 47, 73.
Brustolon, Andrea, 48, 52.
Buonconsiglio, Vitrulio, 5.

Cabianca (Francesco Penso), 52.
Caliari, *see* Veronese, Paolo.
Callot, Jacques, 62.
Campagnola, Domenico, 4, 61.
Campagnola, Giulio, 53.
Canaletto (Antonio Canal), 4, 45, 51, 64-66, 70, 72, 73-74, 78.
Canova, Antonio, 53.
Cantarini, Simone, 36, 46.
Cappella, *see* Daggiù.
Caravaggio, Michelangelo da (Merisi),

1, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 33, 36, 39, 40, 53, 54, 68, 84.
Carboncino, Giovanni, 27.
Carlevaris, Luca, 48, 50-51, 53, 60, 64, 74.
Carlevaris, Marianna, 71, 75.
Carneo, Antonio, 2, 40-42, 44, 49, 59, 75.
Carneo, Giacomo, 41, 75, 77.
Carniello, Giacomo, 40.
Carpaccio, Vittore, 4, 51.
Carpioni, Giulio, 14, 33, 36-37, 75, 86.
Carracci, The, 4, 6, 11, 18, 35, 45, 53, 54, 56, 57, 60.
Carracci, Annibale, 4.
Carriera, Rosalba, 41, 46, 49, 70, 75.
Casanova, Francesco, 50, 74, 83.
Cassana, Giovanni Francesco, 26.
Cassana, Niccolò, 42, 47, 49, 75.
Casser, Sebastiano (Il Tintoretto), 6.
Castello, Valerio, 30, 63.
Castiglione, Giovanni Benedetto, 36.
Cavalier d'Arpino (Giuseppe Cesari), 21, 38.
Cedini, 73.
Celesti, Andrea, 28, 47, 80.
Cerquozzi, Michelangelo, 51.
Cervelli, Federico, 28, 39, 46, 56.
Chiaruttini, Francesco, 72, 74, 75.
Chioggiotto, *see* Marinetti, A.
Cignaroli, Felice, 69, 72, 74, 81.
Cigoli, Ludovico, 14.
Cittadini, Pier Francesco, 35.
Coello, Claudio, 35.
Coli, Giovanni, 39, 75.
Contarini, Giovanni, 7, 29.
Corona, Leonardo, 7.
Correggio (Antonio Allegri), 3, 32, 43, 47, 57.
Cortona, *see* Berrettini, Pietro.
Crespi, Giuseppe Maria (Lo Spagnuolo), 19, 53, 54, 79.
Crosato, Giambattista, 70, 76.
Cussin, Monsù, 50.

Daggiù, Francesco (Cappella), 69, 81.
Dal Friso, Alvise, 7.
Damini, Angela, 76.
Damini, Pietro (da Castelfranco), 13, 76.
Damini, Vincenzo, 47, 70, 76.
Dance, Nathaniel, 71.
D'Anna, Baldassare, 6.
Da Ponte, The, *see* Bassano, The.
Daumier, Honoré, 62.
David, Ludovico, 43.
De' Ferrari, Antonio (Foler), 7.
Deferrari, Orazio, 41.
Della Rosa, Saverio, 72.
De Mura, Francesco, 70.
D'Este, Napoleone, 74.
Desubleo, Michele, 24, 82.
Diamantini, Giuseppe, 46.
Diziani, Antonio, 74.
Diziani, Gaspare, 62, 74, 82.
Domenichino (Domenico Zampieri), 18.

Eismann, Johann Anton, 50, 76.
Elsheimer, Adam, 4, 16, 17, 18, 20, 40, 83.
Everardi, Angelo (Fiammenghino), 50, 74.

Faccini, Pietro, 53.
Falceri, Biagio, 46.
Falck, Geremia, 21.
Faldoni, Giovanni Antonio, 53.
Fetti, Domenico, 1, 14-17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 26, 29, 31, 33, 39, 41, 54, 76, 78.

Fialetti, Odoardo, 6, 36.
Fiammingo, Paolo (Pauwels Frank?), 4, 6, 50.
Filgher, Konrad, 50.
Flipart, Giuseppe, 71, 76-77, 79.
Fontebasso, Francesco, 69, 82, 85, 86.
Forabosco, Gerolamo, 2, 14, 29, 33-35, 38, 45, 52, 77.
Franco, Battista, 5.
Frank, Pauwels, *see* Fiammingo, Paolo.
Fratino, Giovanni (Del Mio), 5.
Fumiani, Gianantonio, 28, 41, 46, 77.
Furini, Francesco, 30.

Gai, Antonio, 52.
Galgario, Fra, *see* Ghislandi, V.
Galliari, Bernardino, 76.
Gambarini, G., 79.
Gaspari, Pietro, 74.
Gherardi, Filippo, 39, 75.
Ghislandi, Vittore (Fra Galgario), 2, 49.
Ghisolfi, Giovanni, 64.
Giampiccoli, Giuliano, 61.
Giordano, Luca, 33, 38, 39-40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 55, 56, 79.
Giorgione, 3, 7, 9, 23, 33, 53, 60, 86.
Giovanni da San Giovanni, 19, 56.
Giron, Monsù, 50.
Gobbis, 79.
Golzio, Enrico, 19.
Goya, Francisco de, 23, 54, 62, 71, 76.
Grassi, Nicola, 2, 40, 47, 59, 70, 75, 77, 80, 82.
Greco (Domenico Theotocopuli), 5.
Grubacs, The, 73.
Guardi, the brothers, 50, 74.
Guardi, Francesco, 4, 16, 62, 63, 64, 66-67, 68, 71, 72, 76, 77-78, 79, 83.
Guardi, Gianantonio, 66, 78, 79, 83.
Guardi, Niccolò, 78.
Guercino, (Gianfrancesco Barbieri), 18, 40, 49, 53.

Hals, Frans, 21.
Hogarth, Wiliam, 71.

Ingoli, Matteo, 6.

Joli, Antonio, 74.
Jordaens, Jacob, 42.

Kupetzky, Johann, 49.

Lama, Giulia, 54, 69, 81.
Langetti, Giambattista, 2, 26, 42, 45, 78, 86.
Lastmann, Pieter, 16.
Lazzarini, Elisabetta, 55.
Lazzarini, Gregorio, 2, 34, 38, 48, 52, 55, 58, 74.
Le Clerc, Giovanni, 18, 26, 83.
Le Court, Monsù (Josse de Cort), 52.
Liberi, Marco, 32.
Liberi, Pietro, 14, 28, 31-32, 33, 38, 42, 46, 47, 55, 78, 80.
Licinio, Giulio, 5.
Ligari, Giulio Cesare, 69, 73, 85.
Ligari, Pietro, 85.
Liss, Giovanni (Pan), 1, 15, 18-20, 21, 26, 34, 39, 43, 47, 54, 59, 78-79, 80.
Liss, Giovanni, 19.
Lissandrino, *see* Magnasco, Alessandro.
Locatelli, Andrea, 64.
Longhena, Baldassare, 6, 39.

Longhi, Alessandro, 71, 76, 77, 79, 80.
Longhi, Pietro, 52, 53, 71, 72, 79.
Lorenzino (Francesco Lorenzi), 70, 86.
Lorrain, Claude, 18, 60.
Loth, Carlo, 2, 26, 42-43, 44, 45, 53, 79, 83.
Loth, Ulrich, 26, 42.
Lotto, Lorenzo, 35.

Maffei, Francesco, 2, 13, 30-31, 37, 41, 76, 79.
Maffei, Giacomo, 50.
Maggiotto, Domenico, 69, 77, 81.
Magnasco, Alessandro (called Lissandrino), 28, 55, 56, 57, 62, 63, 72, 83.
Malombra, Pietro, 7.
Manet, Edouard, 3, 54.
Manfredi, Bartolomeo, 24.
Mantegna, Andrea, 3.
Maratta, Carlo, 47.
Marchiori, Giovanni, 52, 56.
Marcola, Marco, 72, 79.
Marescalchi, Pietro (called Lo Spada), 4.
Mariani, Camillo, 17.
Marieschi, Iacopo, 74.
Marieschi, Michele, 74, 83.
Marinetti, Antonio (Chioggiotto), 69, 81.
Marini, Antonio, 50.
Mariotti, Giambattista, 47, 79.
Marolì, Domenico, 50, 79.
Mauri, Antonio (called Maurino), 66, 74.
Mazza, Damiano, 1, 10-11, 12, 80.
Mazzoni, Sebastiano, 2, 28-29, 32, 46, 47, 56, 61, 80, 83.
Menescardi, Giustino, 69, 85.
Mera, Pietro, 6.
Merisi, *see* Caravaggio,
Michelangelo, 3, 5.
Michieli, Parrasio, 5.
Migliara, Giovanni, 74.
Moja, 73.
Mola, Pierfrancesco, 39-40, 80.
Molinari, Antonio, 2, 48, 53, 81.
Monaco, Pietro, 16, 19, 21, 22.
Monet, Claude, 66.
Montemezzano, Francesco, 6, 11, 80.
Moretti, Faustino, 73.
Moretti, Giuseppe, 73.
Moretto (Alessandro Buonvicino), 36.
Morlaiter, Giammaria, 52.
Morlaiter, Michelangelo, 71, 80.
Moroni, Giambattista, 36.
Muliers, Pieter (Tempesta), 61-62, 83-84.
Muttoni, Pietro (Della Vecchia), 14, 15, 18, 24, 32-33, 34, 82, 86.

Negretti, Iacopo, *see* Palma Giovane.
Negri, Pietro, 39, 43.

Orbetto, *see* Turchi, Alessandro.
Ottino, Pasquale, 86.

Padovanino, *see* Varotari, Alessandro.
Pagani, Paolo, 46-47, 55, 78, 80.
Palladio, Andrea, 6, 17.
Palma, Antonio, 5, 7.
Palma Giovane (Iacopo Negretti), 5, 7, 8, 35, 80, 86.
Palma, Iacopo (il Vecchio), 7.
Pannini, Gianantonio, 51, 64, 72, 74, 83.
Paolo dei Freschi or dei Franceschi (Pauwels Frank?), *see* Fiammingo, Paolo.
Passerotti, Bartolomeo, 4.
Pavona, Francesco, 41, 70, 75.
Pedon, Bartolomeo, 50.

Pellegrini, Gianantonio, 46, 55, 56, 58, 77, 81.
Peranda, Santo, 7, 8, 29, 30, 40.
Pesci, Gaspare, 66.
Peterzano (or Petrazzano) Simone, 9.
Piatti, Santo, 46, 55, 81.
Piazzetta, Giacomo, 48, 69.
Piazzetta, Giambattista, 2, 14, 19, 20, 42, 48, 52, 53-54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 64, 69, 70, 81-82.
Pietro da Cortona, *see* Berrettini, P.
Pippi, Giulio, 3.
Piranesi, Giambattista, 72.
Pitteri, Giovan Marco, 53.
Pittoni, Francesco, 59.
Pittoni, Giambattista, 2, 52, 59, 69, 70, 76, 77, 81, 82.
Planta, Francesco, 52.
Poelenburgh, Cornelius, 19.
Polazzo, Francesco, 69, 81.
Polidoro da Lanciano, 5.
Ponchino (called Bazzacco), 5, 11.
Ponte, Da, *see* Bassano.
Ponzone, Matteo, 7, 8, 29, 47.
Poussin, Nicolas, 36, 39, 60.
Pozzoserrato, *see* Toeput, L.
Primaticcio, Francesco, 3.
Procaccini, Giulio Cesare, 43.

Raphael, 3, 5.
Regnier (or Renieri), Niccolò, 24-25, 27, 33, 39, 82.
Rembrandt, 1, 9, 16, 36, 54.
Reni, Guido, 24, 36.
Renoir, Auguste, 3.
Ribera, Giuseppe (called Lo Spagnoletto), 23, 40, 41, 42, 45.
Ricci, Marco, 4, 28, 56, 57, 60-64, 78, 82-83, 84.
Ricci, Sebastiano, 2, 19, 28, 29, 46, 47, 48, 52, 55-59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 69, 73, 78, 82, 83, 85.
Richter, Johann, 73.
Ridolfi, Carlo, 8, 26, 33.
Roberti, Domenico, 64.
Robusti, *see* Tintoretto.
Romani, 73.
Romanino, Girolamo, 33, 86.
Rosa, Francesco, 2, 39, 42.
Rosa, Salvatore, 49, 60, 61, 62, 63, 75, 83.
Rottmayr, Michael, 41.
Rubens, Paul, 1, 9, 15, 19, 20, 21, 31, 54.
Ruschi, Francesco, 2, 36, 38-39, 42, 43, 46, 80, 83, 86.

Salimbeni, Ventura, 21.
Santacroce, The, 5.
Saraceni, Carlo (called Veneziano), 16, 17-18, 21, 22, 26, 33, 42, 83, 86.
Sartori, Angioletta, 71, 75.
Sartori, Felicita, 71, 75.
Savoldo, Gerolamo, 9, 18, 36.
Schiavone (Andrea Meldolla), 5.
Scott, Samuel, 73.
Seiter, Daniele, 43.
Serodine, Giovanni, 14.
Simonini, Francesco, 50, 74, 83.
Solimena, Francesco, 48, 56, 70, 77.
Spolverini, Ilario, 50, 74.
Ston, Michele, 50.
Stroiffi, Ermanno, 24, 26-28, 84, 86.
Strozzi, Bernardo (called Prete Genovese in Venice and Cappuccino in Genoa), 1, 2, 13, 18, 20-24, 26, 27,

28, 29, 32, 34, 35, 39, 41, 49, 53, 54, 75, 80, 84.
Strozzi, Giulio, 24, 29.

Tassi, Agostino, 18.
Tempesta, *see* Muliers, P.
Testa, Pietro, 36, 39, 79.
Tiarini, Alessandro, 34.
Tiepolo, Giambattista, 2, 22, 31, 34, 36, 37, 46, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 62, 64, 66, 68, 69-70, 71, 72, 73, 77, 79, 82, 84-86.
Tiepolo, Giandomenico, 70, 85, 86.
Tiepolo, Lorenzo, 77, 85.
Tinelli, Tiberio, 24, 29, 86.
Tintoretto (Iacopo Robusti), 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 19, 29, 30, 36, 40, 41.
Tironi, Francesco, 74.
Titian (Vecellio), 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 23, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 60, 61, 77.
Todeschini (Giovanni Francesco Cipri), 14, 33.
Toeput, Ludwig (Pozzoserrato), 6, 50.
Traversi, Gaspare, 71, 77.
Travi, Antonio, 28.
Trevisani, Angelo, 59.
Trevisani, Francesco, 48.
Turchi, Alessandro (Orbetto), 24, 27, 86.
Turner, 76.

Ugolini, Agostino, 72.

Van der Heyden, Jan, 65, 73.
Van der Lys, Giovanni, 19.
Van Dyck, Anton, 23, 29, 42.
Van Dyck, Daniel, 24, 82.
Vanni, Francesco, 21.
Vanvitelli, Gaspare, (Van Vittel), 51, 74, 83.
Varotari, Alessandro (called Padovanino), 1, 6, 11-13, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 47, 68, 70, 80.
Varotari, Chiara, 11, 80.
Varotari, Dario, 6, 10, 11, 12, 80.
Vassillacchi, Antonio (called Aliense), 6.
Vecchia, Pietro, *see* Muttoni, Pietro.
Vecellio, *see* Titian.
Velasquez, 1, 9, 17, 23, 35, 77, 79, 84.
Venturini, Angelo, 47.
Vermeer, 1, 9, 65.
Verona, Maffeo, 7.
Veronese, Paolo, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 22, 29, 30, 31, 36, 38, 40, 57, 58, 80.
Vicentino, Andrea, 7, 8.
Visentini, Antonio, 74.
Vittoria, Alessandro, 17.
Vouet, Simon, 19, 24, 33, 84.

Watteau, 64.
Weissenkirker, Hans, 42, 43.
Wilson, Richard, 71.

Zais, Giuseppe, 56, 64, 74, 83.
Zanchi, Antonio, 2, 39, 43, 44-45, 48, 53, 54, 69, 81, 86.
Zaniberti, Filippo, 2, 29-30, 86.
Zelotti, Giambattista, 13.
Zilotti, Bernardo, 61.
Zompini, Gaetano, 47, 86.
Zuccarelli, Francesco, 64, 72, 74, 83.
Zugno, Francesco, 66, 70, 74, 86.

GEOGRAPHICAL INDEX

AMPEZZO (CARNIA)
Painting by N. Grassi, 77.

AMSTERDAM
Rijks Museum: Decoration by G. A. Pellegrini, 55. *Death of Orion* by C. Loth, 43.
Beels Collection: *Vanity* by B. Strozzi, 21.
Formerly in the Reynst Collection: Paintings by G. Liss, 19.

ANCONA
Regio Museo: Paintings by G. Carpioni, 37.

ANTWERP
Brouwer Huis: Decoration by G. A. Pellegrini, 55.

AQUILA
S. Agostino: Paintings by V. Damini, 76.

ASCOLI
Pinacoteca: Four paintings by N. Grassi, 77. *Capture of Princess Ferinda* by N. Grassi, 75. *Olindo and Sophronia* by G. B. Crosato, 76.

AUGSBURG
Museum: *Landscape* by Eismann, 50.
Barfüsserkirche: *Baptism of Christ* by N. Grassi, 59.
Külner Collection: *The Seductions of Phryne* by G. B. Langetti, 42.

BADEN (near VIENNA)
Two peasant girls tickling a sleeping youth by G. Angeli, 81.

BAGNOLI (PADUA)
Widman Garden: Statues by A. Bonazza, 52.

BASSANO
Pinacoteca: *Seascapes* by M. Ricci, 62.

BELLUNO
San Pietro, Fulcis Chapel: Frescoes by S. Ricci, 57.
Palazzo Bertoldi: Frescoes by S. Ricci, 57.

BERGAMO
Accademia Carrara: Sketch for the altar-piece of S. Massimo, Padua, by G. B. Tiepolo, 85. *Rio dei Mendicanti* by F. Guardi, 77.
S. Maria Maggiore: Painting by A. Zanchi, 44, 86.
Goltara-Lussana Collection: *The Good Samaritan* by A. Zanchi, 45; plate 51.

BERLIN

Kaiser Friedrich Museum: *Venus* by Titian, 4. *St. Paul* by G. Liss, 20. Paintings by G. Carpioni, 37. *Diana and Actæon* by P. Liberi, 32. *Elijah visited by the angel* by F. Maffei, 31, 76; plate 30. *The Toilet of Venus* by S. Ricci, 69. Drawings (recently acquired) by P. Longhi, 79. Book known as the Book of Tiepolo, 85, 86.

Exhibition of 1927 (Wertheim): *Eumenes and Roxana* by G. Forabosco, 34. *Crucifixion* by S. Piatti, 81.

Formerly in the Cassirer Collection: *Cain and Abel* by G. Liss, 20.

Formerly in the Haberstock Collection: *Caprice* by F. Guardi, 62; plate 74.

Haberstock Collection: *The Mocking of Job* by N. Grassi, 59, 80.

Sir Horace Rumbold's Collection: *Fruitsellers* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54.

Private Collections: *The Finding of Moses* by S. Mazzoni, 28. *Lot and his daughters* by G. Forabosco, 34. *Orlando, Rodomonte and Fiordiligi* by G. Forabosco, 34.

BOLOGNA

Pinacoteca: *St. Martin on horseback* by G. F. Cassana, 26. *Seascape* by M. Ricci, 63; plate 75. *Seascape* by M. Ricci, 63.

Palazzo Pepoli: *Fates* by G. M. Crespi, 54.

Modiano Collection: Sketch by G. B. Tiepolo, 85.

Podio Collection: *Exaltation of the Cross* by D. Mazza, 10.

Private Collection: *David* by G. Forabosco, 34; plate 35.

BORDEAUX

Museum: *Rebecca at the well* by G. B. Pittoni, 69.

BRESCIA

Duomo: *Procession* by F. Maffei, 31.

S. Francesco: *Miracle of St. Anthony* by F. Maffei, 31.

BRUNSWICK

Museum: *Archimedes* by G. B. Langetti, 42. *Hercules* by Vecchia, 33. *Young Girl* by G. B. Bellotto, 45; plate 53b.

BUDAPEST

Museum: *Kermesse* by G. Liss, 19. Paintings by G. Carpioni, 37. *Annunciation* by B. Strozzi, 22. *Jupiter and Mnemosyne* by M. Liberi, 32; plate 32. *Sleeping Girl* by D. Fetti, 14. *Flagellation* by N. Grassi, 77.

CALDOGNO (VICENZA)

Villa Pagello: Frescoes by G. Carpioni, 37.

CANDIANA (PADUA)
Ceiling by M. Morlaiter, 80.

CAPODISTRIA
Duomo: *The Marriage at Cana* by A. Zanchi, 44.

CASSEL
Gemäldegalerie: *Brothel Scene* by G. Liss, 19. *Bacchanal* by V. Damini, 70. *The Game of Morra* by G. Liss, 20; plate 9.

CIVIDALE
Palazzo Pontotti: Paintings by F. Chiaruttini, 75.

CONTARINA (POLESINE)
Villa Carrer: *Portrait of the artist* by G. Carpioni, 37.

DARMSTADT
Museum: Drawing by Titian, 3. Drawing by Canaletto, 65.

DRESDEN
Gemäldegalerie: *David* by D. Fetti, 14. *The lost Sheep* by D. Fetti, 16; plate 5. *Martyrdom of St. Agnes* by D. Fetti, 16. *The Wicked Servant* by D. Fetti, 16. *The Labourers in the Vineyard* by D. Fetti, 16. *The lost Piece of Silver* by D. Fetti, 16. *The Good Samaritan* by D. Fetti, 17. *Parable of the Blind Men* by D. Fetti, 16; plate 6. *Coronis pursued by Neptune,* by G. Carpioni 37. *Latona changing the peasants into frogs* by G. Carpioni, 37; plate 41. *Job and his friends* by C. Loth, 43. *Old Woman with three children* by Vecchia, 33. *Warrior* by Vecchia, 33; plate 33. *Hercules at the cross-roads* by G. Liss, 20, 79. *Magdalene guided by the Angel* by G. Liss, 20. *Ascension* by S. Ricci, 57; plate 63. Eight landscapes by M. Ricci, 61. *Apollo and Marsyas* by G. B. Langetti, 42; plate 48. *David* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54. *Reception of the Ambassador Colloredo* by L. Carlevaris, 51; plate 58. *Landscape* by Eismann, 50. *The Drunkenness of Noah* by A. Molinari, 48; plate 55. *David* by G. Diamantini, 46. *Death of Agrippina* by G. B. Pittoni, 59. *Death of Seneca* by G. B. Pittoni, 59. *Landscape* by C. Brisighella, 50. *Birth of Venus* by G. B. Tiepolo, 70, 85. *Sacrifice of Isaac* by G. B. Tiepolo, 58; plate 6 .

DUBLIN
National Gallery: *Ladies with parasols* by G. B. Piazzetta, 20, 54.

EDINBURGH
National Gallery: *Landscape with Monks* by S. and M. Ricci, 63; plate 76. Drawing by M. Ricci, 61.

ESTE

Chiesa della Salute: Painting by A. Zanchi, 45.

FAENZA

Pinacoteca: *Salome* by F. Maffei, 31, 79; plate 29.

FANO

Filippini: *The Raising of Tabitha*, attributed to G. Liss, 19.

FELTRE

Museum: *Bacchanal* by A. Marini, 50.

FIELIS (CARNIA)

Painting by N. Grassi, 77.

FLORENCE

Uffizi: *Toilet of Venus* by G. Liss, 20. *The Prodigal Son*, copy from G. Liss, 20, 79. *Portrait of the Artist* by P. Bellotto, 45, 73. *Christ and the Tribute Money* by B. Strozzi, 22. Sketch for the *Parable of the Wedding Guest* by B. Strozzi, 22. *Portrait of a Warrior* by Niccolò Cassana, 49. *Portrait of the Artist* by N. Cassana, 49. *Neptune and Coronis* by G. Carpioni, 75. *Child with basket of fruit and flowers* by G. Carpioni, 75. *Portrait* by G. Forabosco, 35. *Portrait of the poet Giulio Strozzi* by T. Tinelli (?), 24, 29, 84; plate 24. *The Gamblers* by G. B. Langetti, 78. *The Punishment of Ananias* by A. Fumiani, 77. Drawing by P. Vecchia, attributed to Giorgione, 86. (Corridor) Portraits by S. Bombelli, 49.

Palazzo Pitti: Frescoes by S. Ricci, 56. *Holy Family and Saints* by D. Mazza, 10, 11; plate 2. *The Preaching of John the Baptist* by C. Saraceni and A. Elsheimer, 17. Decoration by Pietro Berrettini, 32.

Museo Bardini: Drawings by G. B. Tiepolo, 85.

Annunziata: *The Death of St. Joseph* by C. Loth, 43.

Palazzo Marucelli in Via San Gallo: Frescoes by S. Ricci, 56.

Corsini Collection: *Four Episodes from the Life of Christ* by D. Fetti, 14.

Spinelli Collection: *Diogenes* by P. F. Mola, 80.

Private Coll.: *Old Woman* by B. Strozzi, 23, 84; pl. 16. *Portrait* by N. Dance, 71.

FORMEASO

Paintings by N. Grassi, 59, 75, 77.

FRANKFORT

Städelsches Institut: *The Charlatan* by A. Longhi, 71; plate 87b. *Annunciation* by G. B. Pittoni, 81.

FRATTA POLESINE

Parish Church: Two pictures by M. Bortoloni, 47.

GENOA

Accademia Ligustica: Sketch for the *Parable of the Wedding Guest* by B. Strozzi, 22.
Palazzo Rosso: *The Cook* by B. Strozzi, 34. *Madonna della Pappa* by B. Strozzi, 21.
Caviglia Collection: *Mercury and Argus* by G. B. Langetti, 42.

GRENOBLE

Museum: *Sleeping Child.* Copied from B. Strozzi, 23, 84

HAGUE, THE

Rijks Museum: *Landscape* by M. Ricci, 61.
Schneider Collection: *Bullfight in Piazza San Marco* by G. Liss, 19.

HAMBURG

Kunsthalle: Drawing (*Bambocciata*) by G. Liss, 19.

INNSBRUCK

Ferdinandeum: *The Brawl* by G. Liss, 19.

KARLSRUHE

Gemäldegalerie: *Young Girl* by Vecchia, 33; plate 34.

LEGHORN

Volpini Collection: Two paintings by M. Bonechi, 82.

LEGNAGO

Formerly in the Maggioni Collection: *Concert* by B. Strozzi, 23, 84.

LENDINARA

Duomo: *Ecce Homo* by D. Fetti, 15.
Santuario della Vergine, Sacristy: *Bust of an Apostle* by P. F. Mola, 40.
S. Biagio: Altar-piece by A. Zanchi, 44.

LENINGRAD

Hermitage: *The Sacrifice of Abraham* by P. Pagani, 47. *Portrait of the actor Gabrielli* by D. Fetti, 17; plate 7. *The Healing of Tobias* by B. Strozzi, 22. *Bacchanal* by N. Cassana, 75. *Eumenes and Roxana* by Padovanino, 34.
Private Collection: Paintings from the Palazzo Dolfin by G. B. Tiepolo, 58.

LILLE

Museum: *Assumption* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54. *The Finding of* Moses by G. Liss, 20.

LONDON

National Gallery: *Portrait of a Priest* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54; plate 61. *Mercury casting a spell upon Argus* by C. Loth, 43; plate 50. *Ganymede and the Eagle* by D. Mazza, 10, 11. *The three Graces* by F. Zaniberti, 30; plate 27. *The Finding of Moses* by F. Zugno, 70. *The Betrothal* by L. Giordano or Maffei, 79. *The Lagoon near Malghera* by F. Guardi, 67; plate 85. *The Exhibition of the Rhinoceros* by P. Longhi, 71. *The School of the Carità* by Canaletto, 65; plate 81. *Festival of San Rocco* by Canaletto, 65. *View of Eton* by Canaletto, 65, 73; plate 82b. Sketch for the altar-piece in San Massimo at Padua by G. B. Tiepolo, 85. Sketches of *St. Massimo and St. Osvaldo* by G. B. Tiepolo, 70. *Crucifixion* by G. B. Tiepolo, 70. Four paintings by Giandomenico Tiepolo, 70. *Portrait of Holford* by L. Lotto, 35. *Landscape* by Jan van der Heyden, 65; plate 82a. *Portrait* by R. Wilson, 71.

Buckingham Palace: *Landscape* by Titian, 3.

Hampton Court: *The Colosseum* by Canaletto, 65.

Duke of Richmond's Collection: *Whitehall from Richmond House* by Canaletto, 65, 73.

Sir R. Witt's Collection: Drawings by Canaletto, 65.

Formerly in the Benson Collection: *Resurrection* by G. Romanino, 33.

LUCCA

Portrait of Gaspare Mansi by A. Damini, 76.

LYONS

Museum: *Canonico dei Carracci* by G. Forabosco, 35.

MALAMOCCO

Parish Church: *Shipwreck* by G. Forabosco, 35; plate 36.

MANTUA

Palazzo Ducale: *Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes* by D. Fetti, 15. *Trinity* by Rubens, 14. *Apostles* by D. Fetti, 14. *Fruitseller* by B. Strozzi, 34.

Duomo: Fresco in the apse by D. Fetti, 14.

MARESON DI ZOLDO ALTO (BELLUNO)

Painting by G. Brusaferro, 73.

MILAN

Brera: *Madonna del Carmine* by G. B. Tiepolo, 58; plate 65. *Portrait of the artist* by P. Bellotto, 45. *A Knight of Malta* by B. Strozzi, 23. *Portrait of an Old Woman* by A. Carneo, 41.

Poldi Pezzoli Gallery: *The Lagoon* by F. Guardi, 77. Small altar-piece by Lorenzino, 86.

Castello sforzesco: *The two Sisters* by G. Forabosco, 35; plate 37. *St. Sebastian* by N. Renieri, 24; plate 17a.

Ambrosiana: *The Plague of Serpents* by Giulio Cesare Ligari, 69.

S. Bernardino dei Morti: Frescoes by S. Ricci, 56.

Senator Albertini's Collection: *Episodes from the Life of Abraham* by Giandomenico Tiepolo, 70.

Formerly in the Mobili di San Giovanni Collection: *Rape of the Sabines*, by F. Zaniberti, 86.

MIRANO

Altar-piece by G. B. Tiepolo (aided by Giandomenico), 85.

MODENA

Museo Civico: *The Sertorio Family* by N. Dance, 71.

MONDOVI

Sanctuary: Frescoes by M. Bortoloni, 47.

MORI (TRENTINO)

Drawings by G. B. Pittoni, 82.

MOSCHEN

Castle of Count Tiele: Paintings by Gaetano Zompini, 86.

MOSCOW

State Museum: *Vanity* by G. Liss, 21. *Sacrifice of Isaac* by P. Pagani, 78.

Ostronoff Collection: *Apollo and Marsyas* by G. Liss, 20.

MUNICH

Alte Pinakothek: *Virgin and Saints* by C. Loth, 43. *Temptation of St. Anthony* by S. Ricci, 62; plate 73. *Ladies' Concert* by F. Guardi, 67; plate 84. *Rinaldo and Armida* by F. Zaniberti, 30; plate 26. *Venus and Cupid* by A. Bellucci, 47; plate 54.

Theatiner-Kirche: Altar-piece by A. Zanchi, 44. Altar-piece by C. Loth, 44.

Private Collection: *Adoration of the Magi* by C. Saraceni, 18.

NANCY

Museum: *Transfiguration* by Rubens, 14.

NAPLES

Pinacoteca: *Landscapes with small figures* by C. Saraceni and A. Elsheimer, 17. *Shepherd with flute* by L. Giordano, 33.

S. Maria dell'Aiuto: Two paintings by G. Traversi, 77.

NEW YORK

Boross Collection: *Joseph interpreting dreams* by G. B. Langetti, 42.

Fuller Collection: *Portrait* by T. Tinelli, 29.

NOALE

Parish Church: *Ascension* by D. Mazza, 10, 12.

PADUA

Museo Civico: *Temptation of St. Anthony* by G. Diziani, 62. *Portrait of a Condottiero* by S. Mazzoni, 28; plate 23. *St. Francis* by C. Saraceni, 18. *Menichina Padovana* by G. Forabosco, 77. *Salome* by E. Stroiffi, 27; plate 19. *Santa Martire* by N. Renieri, 25; plate 17b.

Duomo: Altar-piece by G. A. Pellegrini, 55.

Sant'Antonio: Ceiling by P. Liberi, 32; plate 31. *Beheading of John the Baptist* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54.

Eremitani: *The Incredulity of St. Thomas* by Padovanino, 12; plate 3. Sacristy: Altar-Piece by G. A. Pellegrini, 55. *St. John the Baptist* by M. Desubleo, 24.

Filippini: *Pietà* by E. Stroiffi, 27; plate 18. *Adoration of the Magi* by F. Maffei, 31.

S. Giustina: *Moses on Mount Sinai* by F. Maffei, 31. *Abraham and the Angels* by G. F. Cassana, 26. *Nadab and Abihu* by G. F. Cassana, 26. *Altar-piece of St. Gregory* by S. Ricci, 57. Chapel of the Sacrament: Frescoes by S. Ricci, 57.

Immacolata: *Crucifixion of St. John in Patmos* by F. Maffei, 79.

Casa del Clero: *Two Saints* by F. Maffei, 79.

Palazzo Manzoni: Frescoes by B. Bisson, 72. Ceiling by B. Bisson, 73.

Private Collection: Portraits by Marianna Carlevaris, 71.

Collection of the Antiquary Zamatto: *Seller of Vegetables* by Padovanino, 34. *Fishmonger* by G. Forabosco, 34, 35.

PALERMO

Chiaramonte Bordonaro Collection: Sketch by G. Menescardi, 70.

PARIS

Louvre: *Preaching of John the Baptist* by P. F. Mola, 80. *Fishing* by Annibale Carracci, 4. *Hunting* by Annibale Carracci, 4. *Rural Scene* by Giorgione, 3.

Lazzaroni Collection: *Regatta*, and *Departure of the State Barge* by L. Carlevaris, 51.

Formerly in the Orloff Collection: Drawing by G. B. Tiepolo, 69.

P. Romanelli Collection: *Portrait of a Woman* by F. Cignaroli, 81, 82.

Formerly in the Wildenstein Collection: *Portrait* by G. Forabosco, 35.

Worms Collection: *Harlequin, Columbine and Pantaloon* by M. Marcola, 72.
On sale: *Self-Portrait* (?) by B. Strozzi, 24.

PARMA

University: *Mucius Scevola in the presence of Porsenna* by S. Ricci, 56. *Rape of Helen* by S. Ricci, 56. *Languishing Antioco* by S. Ricci, 56.

PESARO

Pinacoteca: *Conversion of St. Paul* by F. Maffei, 79.
Museo Mosca: *Cleopatra* by N. Renieri, 82.

PHILADELPHIA

Widener Collection: *Satyr and Peasant* by G. Liss, 20.

PIAZZOLA (PADUA)

Duke Camerini's Collection: *The Letter* by N. Renieri, 24. *Magdalene* by N. Renieri, 24. *Shipwreck* by G. Le Clerc, 18, 26.

PORTOGRUARO

Duomo: *Last Supper* attributed to G. Carneo (the elder), 40.

POSEN

Raczynski Collection: *Rape of Europa* by B. Strozzi, 22; plate 12.

RIMINI

Pinacoteca Civica: *Archimedes* by G. B. Langetti, 42. *The Horsemen of the Apocalypse* by F. Maffei, 79. *Angels and Demons* by F. Maffei, 79.

ROME

Accademia di S. Luca: *Old Woman spinnning* by P. F. Mola, 80.
Galleria Barberini: *Old Woman* by P. F. Mola. Decoration by P. Berrettini, 32.
Galleria Borghese: *Venus* by G. Forabosco, 77.
Galleria Capitolina: *The Rich Glutton* by C. Saraceni, 18. Double portrait attributed to T. Tinelli, 29.
Galleria Corsini: *Menichina Padovana* by G. Forabosco, 35, 77; plate 38.
Galleria Doria: *Magdalene* by D. Fetti, 15.
Chiesa dell'Anima: *The Miracle of St. Benone* by C. Saraceni, 17.
S. Niccolò da Tolentino: Frescoes by F. Gherardi, 39.
Palazzo Colonna: Frescoes by F. Gherardi, 39.
Formerly in the Aldo Briganti Collection: *Peasant-woman among ruins* by G. Carpioni, 37.

Contini Collection: *View with ruins and figures* by M. and S. Ricci, 61. Drawings by G. B. Tiepolo, 85.

Pogliani Collection: Sketch by D. Maggiotto, 81.

Formerly in the Iandolo Collection: *Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane* by G. Liss, 20, 78.

ROUEN

Museum: Painting by G. Traversi, 77.

Private Collection: Three Paintings by G. Traversi, 77.

ROVIGO

Accademia dei Concordi: *The Death of Cleopatra* by S. Mazzoni, 28; plate 21. *The Finding of Moses* by S. Mazzoni, 28; plate 22.

Municipio: *Pietà* by F. Maffei, 30.

Museo del Seminario: *Avogadori and Puttini* by S. Bombelli, 49. *The Triumph of Diana* by G. Diziani, 82.

Rotonda: *Glory of the Virgin* by F. Maffei, 30.

SALZBURG

Museum: *Landscape* by J. A. Eismann, 50.

SAN REMO

Formerly in the Thieme Collection: Sketch for the Altar-Piece of S. Massimo at Padua by G. B. Tiepolo, 85.

SAN SALVARO (PADUA)

Ex-Benedictine Convent: *Muses and Actors* by A. Zanchi, 45.

SANTA GIUSTINA (FELTRE)

Annunciation by C. Saraceni, 83.

SARASOTA (FLORIDA, u. s. a.)

Ringling Collection: Panels of the organ of San Raffaele at Venice by F. Guardi, 66, 78; plate 83.

SCHLEISSHEIM

Castle Museum: *Landscape* by J. A. Eismann, 50. Frescoes by I. Amigoni, 55.

SEBENICO

Duomo: Altar-piece by F. Zaniberti, 29.

SEZZA (CARNIA)

Paintings by N. Grassi, 66.

SOMAGLIA (near CASALPUSTERLENGO)

Triumph of the Ark of the Covenant by S. and M. Ricci, 59, 60, 63.

STUPINIGI

Villa Reale: Frescoes by G. B. Crosato, 70.

STUTTGART

Gemäldegalerie: *Old Woman* by P. Bellotto, 45, 73; plate 53a. *The Finding of Moses*, School of Tiepolo, 70.

THIENE

Parish Church: *Solomon addressing the people* by M. and S. Ricci, 59, 60, 63.

TOLMEZZO (CARNIA)

Duomo: Paintings by N. Grassi, 77.

Tribunal: Paintings by F. Chiaruttini, 75.

TRENTO

Museum: *Bust of Saint* by F. Guardi, 78. Paintings attributed to G. B. Tiepolo, 85, 86. Paintings by F. Fontebasso, 85.

Private Collection: *David* by G. Forabosco, 34.

TREVISO

Pinacoteca: *Repudiation of Hagar* by F. Ruschi, 39; plate 43.

S. Niccolò: Altar-piece by A. Zanchi, 44.

Chiesa del Beato Enrico: *Christ and the Tribute Money* by B. Strozzi, 22.

TRIESTE

Museo Civico: *Ecce Homo* by N. Grassi, 59, 75; plate 69. Sketch for the *Birth of Venus* by G. B. Tiepolo (forgery), 70, 85.

Museo Rivoltella: *Landscape* by S. and M. Ricci, 63; plates 77b and 78b.

Segrè-Sartorio Collection: *Tempest* by P. Tempesta, 84.

Oreste Sartorio Collection: *Martyrdom of St. Agatha* by G. B. Tiepolo, 85.

Private Collection: *St. Francis receiving the stigmata* by M. da Caravaggio, 9. Formerly in a Private Collection (afterwards Iandolo, Rome): *Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane* by G. Liss, 78.

Braidotti Collection (formerly in Udine): *The Rescue of Moses* by N. Grassi, 59. *Madonna* by N. Grassi, 59.

UDINE

Museo del Castello: *Waterfall with small figures* by M. Ricci, 83. *St. Francis receiving the stigmata* by M. da Caravaggio, 9. *Virgin and Magistrates* by G. Carneo, 41. *The Virgin with the Venetian Governor* by A. Carneo, 41.

Archbishop's Palace: Frescoes by G. B. Tiepolo, 58, 59; plate 67. Frescoes by F. Fontebasso and G. B. Tiepolo, 69, 85, 86.

Duomo: *Isaac blessing his son*, attributed to A. Carneo, 41.

S. Giacomo: *Christ and the Tribute Money* by A. Carneo, 41; plate 44.

Chiesa dell'Ospedale: *Adoration of the Magi* by N. Grassi, 59; plate 70.

Chiesa della Pietà: Chiaroscuri by G. B. Tiepolo, 70.

Braidotti Collection: see under Trieste.

Formerly in the Caiselli Collection: *Autumn and Winter* by A. Carneo, 41; plate 45. *Vertumnus and Pomona* by A. Carneo, 41; plates 46 a-b. *Beggar* by A. Carneo, 41. *Soldiers playing cards* by A. Carneo, 41; plate 47. *Vagrant Woman* by A. Carneo, 41.

UTRECHT

Exhibition of 1899: *Prodigal Son* by G. Liss, 20, 79.

VENICE

Accademia: *Homer* by P. F. Mola, 40, 80. *St. John the Baptist in his youth* by P. F. Mola, 80. *Bacchanal* by G. Carpioni, 37. *Apollo and Marsyas* by G. Liss, 20. *Daniel in the lions' den* by P. Berrettini, 38. Paintings by D. Mazza, 10. *Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes* by G. B. Pittoni, 59; plate 68. *Landscape* by G. Zais, 64; plate 79. *Anthia and Abrocomas* by G. C. Ligari (?), 73. *Banquet of the Doge Cornaro* by F. Zaniberti, 29. *Christ and the Woman of Samaria* by F. Ruschi, 39; plate 42. *Sibyl* by N. Renieri, 25. *Annunciation* by N. Renieri, 24. *Christ and the Tribute Money* by Vecchia, 33. *St. Giustina and Saints* by Vecchia, 33. *The Marriage at Cana* by Padovanino, 12; plate 4. *Holy Deacon* by Padovanino, 12. *Waterfall* by M. Ricci, 61. *Landscape* by M. Ricci, 61; plate 71. *Moses drawing water from the rock* by M. and S. Ricci, 60, 63. Book of drawings by S. Ricci, 62. *Penitent Monks* (drawing) by S. Ricci, 62; plate 72a. *Magdalene* by C. Saraceni, 18. *David* by D. Fetti, 14, 78. *Melancholy* by D. Fetti, 15. *Portrait of the actor Gabrielli*, copied from D. Fetti, 17, 76. Drawing (recent acquisition) by P. Longhi, 79. *The Fortune-Teller* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54; plate 59. *Tamar and Judah* by the Bassano, 16. *View* by Canaletto, 66. Four paintings attributed to G. B. Tiepolo but by F. Fontebasso, 62, 69, 85. *Moses liberating the people from the plague of serpents* by G. B. Tiepolo, 58. *Pietà* by Titian, 7. *Procession in Piazza San Marco* by Gentile Bellini, 4. *Rio San Lorenzo* by Gentile Bellini, 4.

Museo Correr: *Martyrdom of St. Agatha*, attributed to G. B. Tiepolo, 70, 85. *The Exhibition of the Rhinoceros* by P. Longhi, 71; plate 86. Frescoes from the Villa Zianigo by Giandomenico Tiepolo, 72.

Ducal Palace: *Christ in glory venerated by the doges and their patron saints* by Palma Giovane, 7. *Rape of Europa* by P. Veronese, 22. *Truth discovered by Time* by F. Zaniberti, 29; plate 25. *The Doge Enrico Dandolo preaching the crusade* by C. Saraceni and G. Le Clerc, 18, 26; plate 8. Cartoons for mosaics by S. Ricci, 58.
Palazzo Reale: Sketches for tapestries by F. De Mura, 70.
Ateneo: *David and Isaiah* by E. Stroiffi, 84. *Last Judgement* by A. Zanchi, 44.
Museo dell'Arsenale: *Battle Scenes* by I. Spolverini, 50.
Libreria Marciana: *Sculpture* by B. Strozzi, 22. *Astronomy* by Padovanino, 12.
Querini Stampalia Collection: Paintings by F. Cervelli, 46. *Portrait of a Nobleman* by S. Bombelli, 49; plate 56. *Portrait of a Senator* by S. Bombelli, 49; plate 57. Paintings by Luca Giordano, 40.
Seminario: Ceiling of the Library by S. Ricci, 57. Painting by A. Zanchi, 44.
Scuola dell'Angelo Custode: Altar-piece by S. Ricci, 57.
S. Barnaba: Altar-piece by D. Mazza, 10, 12.
S. Benedetto: Altar-piece by A. Fumiani, 46. *Martyrdom of St. Sebastian* by B. Strozzi, 22; plate 13. *St. Benedict, the Virtues and St. John the Baptist* by S. Mazzoni, 28. *St. Benedict recommending one of the faithful to the Virgin* by S. Mazzoni, 28.
Carmini: *Vision of a Pope* by S. Mazzoni, 28. Frescoes by S. Ricci, 57.
Scuola dei Carmini: Frescoes by S. Piatti, 55. *Prophets and Evangelists* by G. Menescardi, 69, 70. *Assumption* by Padovanino, 70. *Madonna Gloriosa* by G. B. Tiepolo, 52.
Chiesa della Fava: Six Paintings by E. Stroiffi, 27, 84. Altar-piece by I. Amigoni, 55. *Madonna* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54.
S. Francesco della Vigna: *Resurrection* by P. Vecchia, 33.
Scuola di S. Francesco della Vigna: Painting by G. B. Pittoni, 77. *Sacrifice of Isaac* by N. Grassi, 77.
Frari: *Miracle of St. Anthony* by F. Rosa, 42. *Franciscan Saints* by P. Negri, 43.
Gesuati: *Sculpture* by G. Morlaiter, 52. *Dominican Saints* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54. *Pius V and Saints* by S. Ricci, 58.
Gesuiti: *Sermon of St. Francis Xavier* by P. Liberi, 32.
S. Giacomo dell'Orio, Sacristy: Painting by Palma Giovane, 7.
S. Giorgio Maggiore: Altar-piece of the Virgin by S. Ricci, 57. Library: Paintings by G. Coli and F. Gherardi, 75.
S. Giovanni Crisostomo: Altar-piece by C. Loth, 43.
SS. Giovanni e Paolo: Ceiling by G. B. Piazzetta, 54; plate 62.
Chiesa degl' Incurabili: *The Wise and Foolish Virgins* by Padovanino, 13. *The Wedding Guest* by B. Strozzi, 13, 22. Painting by S. Peranda and F. Maffei, 30.

S. Lazzaro degli Armeni: Sketch by S. Piatti, 81.
S. Lio: *Crucifixion* by Della Vecchia, 18, 33.
S. Luca: Altar-piece by N. Renieri, 24.
S. Maria della Salute: *Glory of St. Anthony* by P. Liberi, 32. *Annunciation* by P. Liberi, 32. Altar-piece by J. Amigoni, 55. *The Virgin banishing the plague* by J. Le Court, 52.
S. Maria del Giglio (or Zobenigo): Altar-piece by A. Zanchi, 43, 45; plate 52. Altar-piece by C. Loth, 43, 45. Ceiling by A. Zanchi, 44.
S. Marziale: Ceiling by S. Ricci, 57.
S. Moisè: *Adoration of the Magi* by G. Diamantini, 46. Painting by S. Piatti, 81.
Oratorio dei Crociferi: Paintings by Palma Giovane, 7; plate 1.
Ospedaletto: Altar-piece by D. Mazza, 10. Altar-piece by F. Ruschi, 39. Altar-piece by E. Stroiffi, 27, 84. *Deposition* by C. Loth, 43. *Prophets* by G. B. Tiepolo, 58. *Sacrifice of Isaac* by G. B. Tiepolo, 54, 58.
S. Pantaleone: Ceiling by A. Fumiani, 46. Presbytery: Paintings by L. Carlevaris, 51.
La Pietà: Altar-piece by Chioggiotto, 81.
S. Pietro in Castello: *The Brazen Serpent* by P. Liberi, 32. Altar-piece by F. Ruschi, 39. Altar-piece of by G. Lazzarini, 48. *San Lorenzo Giustiniani imploring Heaven to liberate the city from the plague* by A. Bellucci, 48.
S. Raffaele Arcangelo: Organ-front by F. Guardi, 16, 66, 78.
Redentore: *Ecstasy of St. Francis* by C. Saraceni, 18.
S. Rocco: Two altar-pieces by S. Ricci, 58.
Scuola di S. Rocco: *The Virgin venerated by St. Roch, St. Mark and St. Sebastian* by P. Negri, 43-44. *The Virgin appearing to the victims of the plague* by A. Zanchi, 44. *St. Mary of Egypt* by Tintoretto, 16. *Magdalene* by Tintoretto, 16.
S. Salvatore: *Baptism* by N. Renieri, 24.
Scalzi: *Madonna and Saints* by M. Desubleo, 24.
S. Sebastiano: *The Evangelists* (destroyed) by S. Ricci, 57.
S. Silvestro: *Exaltation of the Cross* (now belonging to the antiquary Podio) by D. Mazza, 10. *Nativity* by L. David, 43.
S. Simeone Piccolo: Altar-piece by A. Venturini, 47. Two paintings by S. Piatti, 81.
S. Stae: Painting by B. Mariotti, 47. Painting by I. Amigoni, 55. *St. Peter freed from his chains* by S. Ricci, 57. *The Triumph of Faith* by S. Ricci, 57. *St. Iacopo bound by an executioner* by G. B. Tiepolo, 58.
S. Teresa: *Crucifixion* by G. B. Langetti, 42. Altar-piece by N. Renieri, 24. Altar-piece by F. Ruschi, 39.

Chiesa dei Tolentini: *Ecstasy of St. Jerome* by G. Liss, 20, 54; plate 10. *St. Lawrence distributing the sacred vestments to the poor* by B. Strozzi, 22. Frescoes by M. Bortoloni, 47. *St. Francis comforted by an angel* by G. Forabosco, 34. *San Magno Vescovo* by G. Forabosco, 34. Painting by S. Peranda and F. Maffei, 30.
S. Vitale: *The Guardian Angel* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54. *Assumption* by S. Ricci, 58. *The Stoning of St. Vitalis* by G. A. Pellegrini, 55. Painting by G. B. Mariotti, 47.
S. Zaccaria: Paintings by G. A. Fumiani, 46. *Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane* by M. Desubleo, 24.
Asta Collection: *Self-portrait* by D. Mazza, 10.
Palazzo Albrizzi: Painting by L. David, 43.
Palazzo Barbaro: *Portrait of the Procurator Grimani* by B. Strozzi, 23.
Collection of the Antiquary Barozzi: *Esau selling his birthright, Eliezer and Rebecca*, pictures by Cappella, 81. *Christ crowned with thorns* by N. Grassi, 59, 80. *Magdalene* by G. Lama, 81.
Italico Brass Collection: *Penitent Monks* by S. Ricci, 62; plate 72b. *Madonna della Pappa* by B. Strozzi, 21; plate 11. *Episodes from the history of Alexander and Darius* by F. Gherardi, 39. *Ecstasy of St. Jerome*, by G. B. Langetti, 42. *St. Lawrence* by Chioggiotto, 81. Sketch for *Two peasant girls tickling a sleeping youth* by G. B. Piazzetta, 81.
Formerly in the Carletti Collection: *St. Jerome* by P. Pagani, 80.
Casa Donà dalle Rose: *Furies, Fates and theological Virtues* by B. Strozzi, 23.
Palazzo Giovanelli: *Sacrifice of Abraham* by G. Liss, 20. *The Mourning for Abel* by G. Liss, 20. *Tempest* by Giorgione, 3. Pastel by F. Pavona, 75.
Palazzo Grassi-Stucky: Frescoes by A. Longhi, 71; plate 88.
Formerly in Baron Hadeln's Collection: *Parable of the Lost Sheep* by D. Fetti, 16.
Laurenti Collection: Replica of the *Romanelli Portrait* (Paris) by F. Cignaroli, 81, 82.
Minisini Collection: *Martyrdom of St. Lawrence* by M. Desubleo, 24.
Casa Mocenigo: Painting by F. Pavona, 75.
Palazzo Papadopoli: *Charlatan* by Giandomenico Tiepolo, 70. *Minuet* by Giandomenico Tiepolo, 70.
Aldo Ravà Collection: *The Usurer* by P. F. Mola, 40, 80. *The Turk* by P. F. Mola, 40, 80.
Palazzo Robilant-Mocenigo: Ceiling by S. Ricci, 57.
Palazzo Sagredo: *Giants* by P. Longhi, 53.
Palazzo Sandi-Porto, Entrance Hall: *Philosophers* by F. Rosa, 42. Ceiling by G. B. Tiepolo, 58; plate 66. *Achilles discovered by Ulysses* by G. B. Tiepolo, 58.

Palazzo Widman-Foscari: *The Sacrifice of Melchizedek* by F. Maffei, 31; plate 28. *Archimedes* by G. B. Langetti, 42.

Dal Zotto Collection: Drawings by M. Ricci, 61, 62. *Views* by M. Ricci, 62. Sketch for *Moses drawing water from the rock* by M. and S. Ricci, 62; plate 78a.

Private Collections: *Landscape with women washing clothes* by A. Magnasco, 63; plate 77a. Four oval pictures by S. Piatti, 81. Painting by F. Lorenzi, 86. *Exhibition of the Rhinoceros* by A. Longhi, 71; plate 87a.

VERONA

Museo Civico, Castelvecchio: *Portrait* by B. Strozzi, 23. *St. Helena* by F. Fontebasso, 82. *Tobias*, copied from D. Fetti, 76. *Last Supper* by F. Maffei, 30.

Various Collections: Paintings by F. Lorenzi, 86.

VICENZA

Museo Civico: *Martyrdom of St. Peter* by F. Maffei, 30. *Glorification of Alvise Foscari* by F. Maffei, 31. Painting of the *Venetian Governors* by F. Maffei, 30, 37. Lunettes from the Palazzo del Podestà by G. Carpioni, 37. *Musician* by G. Carpioni, 37. *Bacchanal* by G. Carpioni, 37. *Soap bubbles* by G. Carpioni, 37; plate 40. *Bust of a lady* by G. Carpioni, 37. *Magdalene* by C. Saraceni, 18. Sketch for the *Ecstasy of St. Jerome* by G. Liss, 20. *The Ecstasy of St. Francis* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54; plate 60. *View with ruins and figures* by M. and S. Ricci, 61.

Duomo: *Adoration of the Magi* by F. Maffei, 30.

Chiesa dei Servi: *Trinity* by F. Maffei, 30, 31.

S. Niccolò: *Episodes from the life of St. Nicholas* by F. Maffei, 30.

Sanctuary of Monte Berico: *The city offering gifts to its protectress the Virgin* by G. Carpioni, 37.

VIENNA

Kunsthistorisches Museum: *Death of Agrippina* by C. Loth, 43. *The dying Jacob blessing Joseph* by C. Loth, 42-43; plate 49. *Jupiter and Mercury with Baucis and Philemon* by C. Loth, 43. *Portrait of the Doge Erizzo* by B. Strozzi, 21, 23; plate 14. *Musicians* by B. Strozzi, 23. *John the Baptist preaching* by B. Strozzi, 22. *Landscapes* by Eismann, 50. *Judith* by Padovanino, 13. *Gladiatorial Combat* by Paris Bordone, 5. Paintings by G. Carpioni, 37. *Bust of a lady* by G. Forabosco, 35; plate 39. *Leander mourned by Tritons and Naiads* by D. Fetti, 17. *The Pearl of great price* by D. Fetti, 17. *The Prodigal Son* by D. Fetti, 16. *The Flight into Egypt* by D. Fetti, 16. *St. Margaret* by D. Fetti, 15. *Moses* by D. Fetti, 15. Painting by G. B. Langetti, 78.

Academy: *The idolatrous Solomon* by A. Celesti (?), 80. *The Prodigal Son* by G. Liss,

20, 78, 79. Four views by N. Guardi, 78. Four views by F. Guardi, 78. Paintings by G. Traversi, 77. *The Woman taken in adultery* by D. Mazza, 10, 12. *St. Bruno*, attributed to Tiepolo, 69.

Auspitz Collection: *David*, by B. Strozzi, 22-23.

Palazzo Castiglioni: Paintings from the Palazzo Dolfin by G. B. Tiepolo, 58.

Czernin Collection: *Sleeping Child* by B. Strozzi, 23, 84; plate 15.

Fischel Collection: Sketch for the *Apparition of the Madonna* by A. Zanchi, 44.

Kieslinger Collection: *Self-portrait* (?) by E. Stroiffi, 27-28; plate 20.

Liechtenstein Gallery: *Christ praying in the Garden of Gethsemane* by S. Ricci, 69, 82. *St. Jerome doing penance* by P. Pagani, 80. *View of the Grand Canal* by Canaletto, 65; plate 80. *David* by G. Forabosco, 34. *Decoration* by A. Bellucci, 48. Former Ceiling by A. Zanchi, 44.

Planiscig Collection: *Portrait of his pupil Giulia Lama* by G. B. Piazzetta, 54.

VIGO D'ANAUNIA (TRENTO)

Parish Church: Altar-piece by F. Guardi, 78.

WÜRZBURG

Archbishop's Palace: Decoration by Giandomenico Tiepolo, 70.

ZOPPOLA (FRIULI)

Castle of Count Zoppola: *Portraits* by F. Pavona, 75.

PLATES 1-88

I

PALMA IL GIOVANE

The doge Cicogna hears Mass.

VENICE, ORATORIO DEI CROCIFERI

Photo Alinari

VT PRÆSENTEM VIRVM AMPLISS. D. MARCI PROCVRAT. IN LOCVM DEMORTVI PRINCIPIS SVB.
STITVAS. TE ROGAMVS DOMINE. XI AVGVSTI. M.D.LXXXV.

2

DAMIANO MAZZA

The Holy Family and Saints.

FLORENCE, PALAZZO PITTI

Photo Alinari

3

PADOVANINO

The Incredulity of St. Thomas.

PADUA, EREMITANI

Photo R. Sopraintendenza, Venice

4

PADOVANINO

Detail of the Marriage at Cana.

VENICE, ACCADEMIA

Photo Alinari

5

DOMENICO FETTI

The Lost Sheep.

DRESDEN, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Bruckmann

6

DOMENICO FETTI

The Parable of the Blind Men.

DRESDEN, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Bruckmann

7

DOMENICO FETTI

Portrait of the actor Gabrielli.

LENINGRAD, HERMITAGE

Photo Braun & Co.

8

CARLO SARACENI AND GIOVANNI LE CLERC
Enrico Dandolo preaching the Crusade in San Marco.
VENICE, DUCAL PALACE
Photo Alinari

9

GIOVANNI LISS

The Game of Morra.

CASSEL, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Hanfstaengl

10

GIOVANNI LISS

The Ecstasy of St. Jerome.

VENICE, CHURCH OF THE TOLENTINI

Photo Alinari

II

BERNARDO STROZZI

Madonna della pappa.

VENICE, BRASS COLLECTION

Photo Filippi

12

BERNARDO STROZZI

The Rape of Europa.

POSEN, RACZYNSKI COLLECTION

Photo Hanfstaengl

13

BERNARDO STROZZI

The Martyrdom of St. Sebastian.

Venice, San Benedetto

Photo Fiorentini

14

BERNARDO STROZZI

The doge Francesco Erizzo.

VIENNA, KUNSTHISTORISCHES MUSEUM

Photo Bruckmann

15

BERNARDO STROZZI

The Sleeping Child.

VIENNA, CZERNIN COLLECTION

Photo Wolfrum

16

BERNARDO STROZZI

Portrait of an Old Woman.

FLORENCE, PRIVATE COLLECTION

17

NICCOLÒ RENIERI

A. St. Sebastian.
MILAN, CASTELLO SFORZESCO

B. Santa Martire.
PADUA, MUSEUM

Photo Alinari

18

ERMANNO STROIFFI

Pietà.

PADUA, CHURCH OF THE FILIPPINI

Photo Fiorentini

19

ERMANNO STROIFFI

Salome.

PADUA, MUSEUM

Photo Alinari

20

ERMANNO STROIFFI

Portrait of the Artist (?)

VIENNA, DR. KIESLINGER'S COLLECTION

21

SEBASTIANO MAZZONI

The Death of Cleopatra.

ROVIGO, ACCADEMIA DEI CONCORDI

Photo Alinari

22

SEBASTIANO MAZZONI

The Finding of Moses.

Rovigo, Accademia dei Concordi

Photo Fiorentini

23

SEBASTIANO MAZZONI

Portrait of a Condottiero.

PADUA, MUSEUM

Photo Fiorentini

24

TIBERIO TINELLI (?)

Portrait of the poet Giulio Strozzi.

FLORENCE, UFFIZI

Photo Alinari

25

FILIPPO ZANIBERTI

Truth Discovered by Time.

VENICE, DUCAL PALACE

Photo Anderson

26

FILIPPO ZANIBERTI

Rinaldo and Armida.

MUNICH, ALTE PINAKOTHEK

Photo Bruckmann

27

FILIPPO ZANIBERTI

The Three Graces.

London, National Gallery

Photo National Gallery, London

28

FRANCESCO MAFFEI

Sacrifice of Melchizedek.

VENICE, PALAZZO WIDMAN-FOSCARI

Photo Alinari

29

FRANCESCO MAFFEI

Salome.

FAENZA, PINACOTECA

Photo Naya

30

FRANCESCO MAFFEI

Elijah visited by the Angel.

BERLIN, KAISER FRIEDRICH MUSEUM

Photo Hanfstaengl

31

PIETRO LIBERI

The Glory of St. Anthony.

PADUA, SACRISTIA DEL SANTO

Photo Ist. Ital. d'Arti Grafiche, Bergamo

32

MARCO LIBERI

Jupiter and Mnemosyne.

BUDAPEST, FINE ARTS MUSEUM

Photo Hanfstaengl

33

PIETRO VECCHIA

Portrait of a Warrior.

DRESDEN, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Bruckmann

34

PIETRO VECCHIA

Portrait of a Young Girl.

KARLSRUHE, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Bruckmann

35

GEROLAMO FORABOSCO

David.

BOLOGNA, PRIVATE COLLECTION

Photo Croci

36

GEROLAMO FORABOSCO

The Shipwreck (detail).

MALAMOCCO, ARCIPRETALE

Photo Filippi

37

GEROLAMO FORABOSCO

The two Sisters.

MILAN, CASTELLO SFORZESCO

38

GEROLAMO FORABOSCO

Menichina Padovana.

ROME, CORSINI GALLERY

Photo Alinari

39

GEROLAMO FORABOSCO

Portrait of a Lady.

VIENNA, KUNSTHISTORISCHES MUSEUM

Photo Wolfrum

40

GIULIO CARPIONI

Soap Bubbles.

VICENZA, MUSEUM

Photo Alinari

41

GIULIO CARPIONI

Latona changes the peasants into frogs.

DRESDEN, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Bruckmann

42

FRANCESCO RUSCHI

Christ and the Woman of Samaria.

VENICE, ACCADEMIA

Photo R. Sopraintendenza, Venice

43

FRANCESCO RUSCHI

The Repudiation of Agar.

TREVISO, PINACOTECA

Photo Archivio Fotografico Nazionale, Rome

44

ANTONIO CARNEO

Christ and the Tribute-Money.

UDINE, SAN GIACOMO

Photo Brisighelli

45

ANTONIO CARNEO

Winter.

UDINE, FORMERLY IN THE CAISELLI COLLECTION

Photo R. Sopraintendenza, Venice

46

ANTONIO CARNEO

A. & B. Vertumnus and Pomona.

UDINE, FORMERLY IN THE CAISELLI COLLECTION

47

ANTONIO CARNEO

Card Players.

UDINE, FORMERLY IN THE CAISELLI COLLECTION

Photo Fiorentini

48

GIAMBATTISTA LANGETTI

Apollo and Marsyas.

DRESDEN, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Brockmanns Nachf.

49

CARLO LOTH

The Dying Jacob blessing Joseph.

VIENNA, KUNSTHISTORISCHES MUSEUM

Photo Hanfstaengl

50

CARLO LOTH

Mercury casting a spell upon Argus.

London, National Gallery

Photo National Gallery, London

51

ANTONIO ZANCHI

The Good Samaritan.

BERGAMO, GOLTARA-LUSSANA COLLECTION

Photo Alinari

52

ANTONIO ZANCHI

Abraham dividing the World with Lot.

VENICE, SANTA MARIA DEL GIGLIO

Photo Alinari

53

PIETRO BELLOTTO

A. An Old Woman.

STUTTGART, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Gemäldegalerie Stuttgart

B. A Young Girl.

BRUNSWICK, MUSEUM

Photo Museum Brunswick

54

ANTONIO BELLUCCI

Venus and Cupid.

MUNICH, ALTE PINAKOTHEK

Photo Hanfstaengl

55

ANTONIO MOLINARI

The drunkenness of Noah.

DRESDEN, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Brückmann

56

SEBASTIANO BOMBELLI

Portrait of a Nobleman.

VENICE, QUERINI-STAMPALIA COLLECTION

Photo Naya

57

SEBASTIANO BOMBELLI

Portrait of a Senator.

VENICE, QUERINI-STAMPALIA COLLECTION

Photo Naya

58

LUCA CARLEVARIS

The Reception of the Ambassador Colloredo.

Dresden, Gemäldegalerie

Photo Bruckmann

59

GIAMBATTISTA PIAZZETTA

The Fortune-Teller.

VENICE, ACCADEMIA

Photo Anderson

60

GIAMBATTISTA PIAZZETTA

The Ecstasy of St. Francis.

VICENZA, MUSEO CIVICO

Photo Alinari

61

GIAMBATTISTA PIAZZETTA

Portrait of a Priest.

London, National Gallery

Photo National Gallery, London

62

GIAMBATTISTA PIAZZETTA

Ceiling of the Chapel of San Domenico (detail).

VENICE, SANTI GIOVANNI E PAOLO

Photo Naya

63

SEBASTIANO RICCI

The Ascension.

DRESDEN, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Bruckmann

64

GIAMBATTISTA TIEPOLO

The Sacrifice of Isaac.

DRESDEN, GEMÄLDEGALERIE

Photo Bruckmann

65

GIAMBATTISTA TIEPOLO

La Madonna del Carmine.

MILAN, BRERA

Photo Alinari

66

GIAMBATTISTA TIEPOLO

The Triumph of Eloquence. Ceiling (detail).

Venice, Palazzo Sandi-Porto

67

GIAMBATTISTA TIEPOLO

Rachel hiding the household gods.

UDINE, ARCHBISHOP'S PALACE

Photo Alinari

68

GIAMBATTISTA PITTONI

The Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes.

VENICE, ACCADEMIA

Photo Alinari

69

NICOLA GRASSI
Ecce Homo.
TRIESTE, MUSEO CIVICO
Photo Alinari

70

NICOLA GRASSI

The Adoration of the Magi.

UDINE, CHIESA DELL'OSPEDALE

Photo Brisighelli

71

MARCO RICCI

Imaginary Landscape.

VENICE, ACCADEMIA

Photo Böhm

72

SEBASTIANO RICCI

A. Penitent Monks, drawing.
VENICE, ACCADEMIA

B. Penitent Monks.
VENICE, BRASS COLLECTION
Photo Filippi

73

SEBASTIANO RICCI

The Temptation of St. Anthony.

MUNICH, ALTE PINAKOTHEK

Photo Riedmann

74

FRANCESCO GUARDI

Capriccio

(Professional Story Teller and view of Cogollo, Trentino).

BERLIN, FORMERLY IN THE HABERSTOCK COLLECTION

Photo Haberstock

75

MARCO RICCI

Storm at Sea.

BOLOGNA, PINACOTECA

Photo Alinari

76

SEBASTIANO AND MARCO RICCI

Landscape with Monks.

EDINBURGH, NATIONAL GALLERY

Photo Annan & Sons

77

A. ALESSANDRO MAGNASCO
Landscape with women washing clothes.
VENICE, PRIVATE COLLECTION
Photo Filippi

B. SEBASTIANO AND MARCO RICCI
Landscape with women washing clothes.
TRIESTE, MUSEO RIVOLTELLA
Photo Cipriani

78

SEBASTIANO AND MARCO RICCI

A. Sketch for Moses drawing water from the Rock.
VENICE, FORMERLY IN THE DAL ZOTTO COLLECTION
Photo Naya

B. Detail of landscape with women washing clothes.
TRIESTE, MUSEO RIVOLTELLA

79

GIUSEPPE ZAIS

Imaginary Landscape.

VENICE, ACCADEMIA

Photo Böhm

80

ANTONIO CANAL

View of the Grand Canal.

VIENNA, LIECHTENSTEIN GALLERY

Photo Wolfrum

81

ANTONIO CANAL

View of the Church and School of the Carità.

London, National Gallery

Photo National Gallery, London

82

A. JAN VAN DER HEYDEN

Landscape.

LONDON, NATIONAL GALLERY

Photo National Gallery, London

B. ANTONIO CANAL

Eton College.

LONDON, NATIONAL GALLERY

Photo National Gallery, London

83

FRANCESCO GUARDI

Organ-panels from San Raffaele, Venice:
Hope and Charity (1747).

SARASOTA (FLORIDA, U. S. A.), RINGLING COLLECTION

Photo Böhler

84

FRANCESCO GUARDI

A Ladies' Concert for the Counts of the North.

MUNICH, ALTE PINAKOTHEK

Photo Bruckmann

85

FRANCESCO GUARDI

The Lagoon near Malghera.

London, National Gallery

Photo National Gallery, London

86

PIETRO LONGHI

The Exhibition of the Rhinoceros.

VENICE, MUSEO CORRER

Photo Naya

Vero Ritratto
di un Rinoceronte
condotto in Venezia
l'anno 1751
l'anno seguente
Disegno
per commissione
del N.H. Giovanni Tron
dei Servi Parrocchiano

87

ALESSANDRO LONGHI

A. The Exhibition of the Rhinoceros.

PRIVATE COLLECTION

(Variant of the picture in the Salom Collection, Venice).

B. The Charlatan.

FRANKFORT, STÄDELSCHES INSTITUT

Photo Städelsches Kunstinstitut

88

ALESSANDRO LONGHI

A Reception.

VENICE, PALAZZO GRASSI-STUCKY

Photo Alinari

THE COLLOTYPE PLATES WERE EXECUTED BY MESSRS. F. BRUCKMANN A.-G., MUNICH. THE TEXT WAS SET IN MONOTYPE BASKERVILLE BY THE OFFICINA BODONI, VERONA. THE BINDING WAS CARRIED OUT BY MESSRS. HÜBEL & DENCK, LEIPZIG.

GETTY CENTER LIBRARY
3 3125 00448 6888